

SLOVAKIA



Published By
THE SLOVAK LEAGUE
OF AMERICA

SLOVAKIA

VOLUME XXXIV

1989-1990

NUMBERS 62-63

A scholarly annual devoted to the history, literature,
and culture of the Slovaks the world over.

Editor

M. MARK STOLARIK
The Balch Institute for Ethnic Studies

Editorial Board

DAVID P. DANIEL
Concordia Theological Seminary

MICHAEL NOVAK
American Enterprise Institute

ROBERT K. EVANSON
University of Missouri

PETER PETRO
University of British Columbia

LOUISE B. HAMMER
Indiana University

NORMA L. RUDINSKY
Oregon State University

Slovak League Advisory Board

DANIEL F. TANZONE
EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK
JOHN A. HOLY

DRAGA DIVINSKA
JOSEPH C. KRAJSA

Publisher

Slovak League of America
870 Rifle Camp Road
West Paterson, NJ 07424

Inquiries regarding subscriptions should be sent to the above
address. The cost of a single issue is U.S. \$6.00.

Manuscripts for possible publication and books for review should be sent to M.
Mark Stolarik, Editor, *Slovakia*, 700 Penfield Avenue, Havertown, PA 19083.

Table of Contents

Editorial	
<i>M. Mark Stolarik</i>	5

ARTICLES

The Impact of the Protestant Reformation on Education in Slovakia	
<i>David P. Daniel</i>	9
Learning and Education in Slovakia during the late 17th and 18th centuries	
<i>Eva Kowalská</i>	28
The Kremlin and The Slovak National Uprising, August-October, 1944	
<i>Michael Kraus</i>	50
An Act of Faith and Integrity: Bishop Korec's Letter to Czechoslovak Television	
<i>Introduced and Translated by Stanislav J. Kirschbaum</i>	61

REVIEW ESSAY

Ján Kačala, Mária Pisárčiková <i>et. al.</i> , <i>Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka</i>	
<i>Ján Šimko</i>	129

REVIEWS

Vladimír Matula, Jozef Vozár <i>et. al.</i> , <i>Dejiny Slovenska, II (1526-1848)</i>	
<i>Gavin Lewis</i>	161
Viliam Čičaj, <i>Knižná kultúra na strednom Slovensku v 16.-18. storočí</i>	
<i>R. Vladimír Baumgarten</i>	163

Viera Urbancová, <i>Slovenská etnografia v 19. storočí</i> Magda Zelinska Ferl	165
Michal Eliáš & Vojtech Šarluška eds., <i>Národná svetlica: Výber dokumentov k dejinám Matice slovenskej</i> John A. Berta	168
Jan Kmeč, <i>Jugoslovensko-slovačke slavističke veze</i> Ján Frydecký	169
Josef Kalvoda, <i>The Genesis of Czechoslovakia</i> Gregory C. Ference	171
Michal Baranovský et. al., <i>Dejiny Slovenska, VI (1945-1960)</i> Stanislav J. Krischbaum	174
Jim & Susan Borchert, <i>Lakewood: The First Hundred Years</i> Carol Towarnicky	176
Ábel Král', <i>Pravidlá slovenskej výslovnosti</i> Louise B. Hammer	179
Books and Articles Received	182
Contributors	190
Guidelines for Manuscripts	192

EDITORIAL

This is a very special issue of *Slovakia*. It reflects the revolutionary changes that swept the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic in 1989. For the first time since our journal was founded in 1951, we are publishing an article by an historian in Slovakia (Ewa Kowalská). This had been impossible before the "velvet revolution" of November, 1989. We hope to bring you more such scholarship from Slovakia in the future.

Furthermore, we are pleased to publish a long article by a Slovak Roman Catholic Bishop who did not send it to us. Instead, he sent it to Czechoslovak television in Bratislava in the spring of 1989 after the latter had aired an expressly anti-Roman Catholic and anti-Slovak series on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Slovak independence. After I read the Slovak text of the Bishop's letter, as it was published in *Jednota* (June 28, July 5, 12, 19, 26, and August 7, 1989), I concluded that it was too important an historical document to leave in an ethnic newspaper. Rather, his missive can be considered a prelude to how Slovak history will be re-written now that the Slovaks are finally free from forty-two years of Communist oppression.

Finally, in the "Books and Articles Received" section of this issue, I still differentiate between those we received from Eastern Europe and those published in the West. Since Slovak historians have been freed from the shackles of Communism only for a few months, they have not yet had the time to re-write our national history without the bias of Marxism. In the next issue of *Slovakia* I may be able to list the books and articles received according to subject, rather than for political reasons. I look forward to doing so.

M. Mark Stolarik
Editor

The Impact of the Protestant Reformation on Education in Slovakia

ARTICLES

The Impact of the Protestant Reformation on Education in Slovakia

DAVID P. DANIEL

National revival moments awakened the ethnic, linguistic and cultural consciousness of the various peoples of the Austrian Empire throughout east central Europe during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These movements were manifestations of the influence of the Enlightenment which penetrated the region prior to and during the reign of Joseph II. Their leaders sought to define, express, and to realize the national aspirations of the peoples of the region. In Slovakia, the movement of national revival (*národné obrodenie*) was particularly significant. It led to the codification of the Slovak language and the creation of a diverse body of literary works in Slovak and thus stimulated the emergence of the cultural and ethnic consciousness of the people and, ultimately, to expressions of their political aspirations. This movement can be considered one of the most significant events in the history of the Slovaks. Its leaders, among them Bel, Bernolák, Tablic, Hollý, Palkovič, Šafárik, Kollár, Kuzmány, Štúr and Hurban, to name but a few, are rightly honored as major contributors to the development of the Slovak language, literature and culture.¹

While this national revival was primarily an expression of Enlightenment thought and was fostered by contacts with German universities and intellectuals, its roots can be traced to the transformation of education which occurred in Slovakia during the early modern era. Members of the Slovak intelligentsia of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were the intellectual and cultural heirs of traditions which can be traced back to the era of

the Reformation and the Counter or Catholic Reformation. During the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, both Protestants and Catholics contributed to the establishment of popular education. The schools in Slovakia, which were founded or reorganized during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, were local outputs of the broad intellectual and cultural currents of early modern European civilization. Their teachers and students had considerable influence, not only among the Magyar and German population of the major cities of Upper Hungary, but also among the Slovaks who comprised the largest proportion of the population in the region. Although often bitterly divided over religious issues, the faculty and graduates of those Protestant and Catholic schools were important agents both of religious reformation and cultural formation.

The history of the transformation wrought in education during the Renaissance and Reformation has attracted much scholarly attention during the last twenty years.² Recent reformation research has devoted considerable attention to the influence of Renaissance humanism upon the curriculum of European universities and its subsequent impact upon the emergence and spread of the Reformation.³ Sharply criticizing what they considered the sterility of late medieval scholasticism, Renaissance humanists sought to engender eloquence, piety and civic responsibility. They emphasized the study of Latin, Greek, and for would-be theologians, Hebrew, as the necessary foundation for reading classic texts in their original languages. In addition, especially in its northern European manifestation, evangelical humanism also stressed religious morality and piety as well as the civic activity and responsibility which characterized Italian humanism.

This influence of Renaissance humanism was not limited to the newly founded or reformed universities. It was clearly evident in the reform or founding of new grammar or middle schools throughout Europe. The education of the young was one of the primary concerns of the ecclesiastical reformers of the sixteenth century. The Protestant reformers and, following the Council of Trent, leaders of Catholic reform, urged that local institutions be established to inculcate pure doctrine and to foster piety as well as to train students in the so-called "*studia humanitatis*." The reformers

encouraged laymen to establish and support local schools as nurseries of humanist learning and of religious formation. In these schools, the form and substance of the traditional curricula was transformed. Evangelical humanist pedagogical methods were adopted by Protestant communities and used to inculcate Lutheran or Reformed theology. These methods were also adapted for use in Catholic schools where they were employed to counter the spread of Protestantism and regain the populace for post-Tridentine Catholicism. Aided by the contemporary growth in the number and variety of printed materials, these schools created a literate public by producing and disseminating religious literature as an aid to institutionalizing ecclesiastical reform.⁴

This was true not merely for Germany or western Europe, where the Reformation began and was first consolidated. It also characterized developments in east and south east central Europe as a whole and in Hungary in particular.⁵ In Hungary, and specifically in Upper Hungary, roughly congruent with modern-day Slovakia, educational reform and the development of local schools was one of the major features of the history of the region during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and has been the subject of considerable scholarly interest.⁶ These schools were particularly important for the population of the region since none of the universities founded in medieval Hungary endured into the sixteenth century. On the one hand, this meant that these local schools had to prepare students for study at foreign universities and therefore maintained close contacts with these universities. On the other hand, it not only meant that a substantial number of students, who could not afford to attend a university abroad, received all of their training in Slovakia but also that the founding of a local university or institution of higher learning eventually emerged as a major concern of both Protestant and Catholic educators. Both of these developments had considerable significance not only for the course of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation in Slovakia but also for the history of popular education and the emergence of a Slovak intelligentsia.

MEDIEVAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Of course, the history of education in Hungary in general and

in Slovakia in particular did not begin with the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Both the Protestant and Catholic reformers built upon, enlarged and transformed educational institutions and traditions which had been established by the end of the fifteenth century. Indeed, in many respects, the way for the pedagogical reformers of the sixteenth century was paved by an increasing interest in education among the citizens, at the court and in the chancellery of Hungary during the time of Matthias "Corvinus" Hunyadi. This growing concern for an education which went beyond that offered primarily in the older ecclesiastical institutions and schools was a manifestation both of changes in society and statecraft as well as of the influence of Italian humanism in Hungary.⁷

While individual teachers could be found in Hungary during the early middle ages and although a school may have existed in the cathedral city of Nitra as early as the twelfth century, it was not until cities had begun to emerge as centers of economic and cultural activity that the existence of more than a handful of schools can be established. In addition, although a few nobles may have employed teachers in their courts, the higher nobility, as a group, did not show much interest in formal academic education prior to the sixteenth century and actually sought to inhibit the children of their serfs from attending school. Thus, most of the early schools were primarily ecclesiastical in character and emphasized the preparation of their students for functions within the church.⁸

The first schools to be established in the region were probably those of the three chapters, in Nitra, Bratislava and Spiš and from the fragmentary documentary evidence available it is clear that each of these chapters had individuals who served as teachers by the end of the thirteenth or at the beginning of the fourteenth centuries. These not only were charged with the instruction of members of the chapter but also taught a few lay students as well. While there may also have been rudimentary schools maintained at the chancellery and in the so-called "vierohodné miesta" or "trust-worthy places," which served as repositories of important legal documents, the evidence for such is fragmentary. The same is true for schools which may have been supported by the various monastic communities in Slovakia. These schools served the specific needs

of the supporting community and taught, besides reading and writing, singing and rudimentary arithmetic or computation, necessary for determining the major, movable festivals of the ecclesiastical year. The *Ars minor* of Donatus and Priscian's *Institutio de artica grammatica* were used as the primary language instruction texts which prepared the students to read the Bible and the Church fathers. However, the reading of works by Vergil, Horace, and Ovid, usually in "Florilegia," collections of excerpts from their works, was not unknown.⁹

More significant, at least in terms of the number that existed, were schools established as agencies of parish churches in the major towns of Slovakia. In northern Hungary, by the end of the fifteenth century, there were more than thirty such parish schools and eleven more towns established schools during the first two decades of the sixteenth century. Thus, at the beginning of the Reformation, most of the larger towns and at least thirteen villages in Slovakia had established schools. Although documentary evidence for the curriculum of these schools is also fragmentary, it does appear that they too were primarily concerned with meeting ecclesiastical needs and preparing students for participation in church services. However, it is reasonable to suppose that these schools were similar to "trivial" Latin schools elsewhere, especially in Germany. The "trivium" of grammar, rhetoric and logic were the foundations of the plan of studies which also included elements of the "quadrivium" of arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy. In addition to the rector who supervised the administration and established, with the approval of the ecclesiastical or municipal authorities, the curriculum, there were several assistants and a cantor was employed to give instruction in music.

Especially important were schools founded at Kežmarok, Bardejov, Levoča and Košice in eastern Slovakia as well as at Kremnica, Banská Bystrica and Banská Štiavnica in central Slovakia.¹⁰ The schools of eastern Slovakia had particularly strong connections with the University of Cracow. Leonard Cox, a former tutor of Henry VII of England, who had been honored as a poet at Cracow, taught at Levoča and then in Košice while Valentin Eck served as rector in Bardejov.¹¹ These schools prepared many of their students

for subsequent university training. Indeed, during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the number of students from the territory inhabited by the Slovaks who attended universities in Italy, Austria, Bohemia and Poland steadily increased. While Italian universities, especially Bologna and Padua were the first to attract students from Hungary, ethnic Slovaks were particularly drawn to the University of Prague, founded by Charles IV in 1348, and then to Cracow where from 1492 the students from Hungary had their own bourse or foundation which provided financial assistance and their own matriculation book in which they registered as students. The University of Vienna also attracted a considerable number of students from Hungary where they were members of the Hungarian nation.¹²

One reason that the number of students from Hungary at foreign Universities grew during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was that the number of city schools in Slovakia increased. Another reason was the closure of the universities which had been founded in Hungary, the chapter school at Veszprem, the University at Pécs, which had close contacts with Bologna and was a center of Italian humanist influence, the short-lived university at Buda, and the Academia Istropolitana, founded by Matthias Corvinus in Bratislava in 1465 at which, in addition to humanism the influence of the "devotio moderna" was evident during its existence which lasted until 1493. Indeed, one of the noteworthy features of both the city schools founded in Slovakia during the decades prior to the inauguration of the Reformation and of the university training received at foreign or domestic universities, was the influence of Renaissance humanism. While Italian humanist influence predominated at Pécs and in the court of Corvinus, the humanism which radiated from the Academia Istropolitana and Cracow, and whose influence was also evident in the court of Louis II and Mary, exhibited many of the particular concerns of the "northern" humanists for whom Desiderius Erasmus was a paradigmatic model.¹³ This increase in the number of schools and the spread of humanist educational methods and concerns was not only a manifestation of a growing interest in and concern for education, especially among the urban population and the higher nobility, but also, together with the closure of domestic universities, helped to

prepare the way for the Reformation and the educational reforms which it effected throughout Slovakia.

THE REFORMATION AND EDUCATION

In Slovakia a substantial transformation in both the number and the quality of schools occurred during the sixteenth century. After the invasion of Hungary by the Turks in the 1520's, the subsequent tripartition of the country and the spread of the Reformation, the number, structure, curriculum and administration of the schools changed considerably.

There is historical evidence for the existence of schools in at least fifty places in Slovakia before 1520. The majority of these were founded during the fifteenth century. To these were added, between 1520 and the end of the century, at least eighty-three schools, the majority of which, sixty-three, were established after 1550. Of these less than ten, including the academy founded by Mikuláš Oláh at Trnava after 1543, were Catholic. Over one hundred of these schools, reformed or newly founded, were Protestant, and most of these were Lutheran. They were supported by city or town councils or established by individual nobles who had converted to Lutheranism either in their primary residences or in one of the towns or villages under their jurisdiction. Almost all of the royal free cities and many of the mining cities had schools while nearly fifty additional towns and villages also had regularly established schools, some supported or aided by local noble families. The Illesházy, Thurzo, Révay, Balaša, Radvan and Mariássi families all established or supported Evangelical schools and school masters.¹⁴

The level of instruction in these Protestant schools in Slovakia differed according to the size of the school, the financial support provided, and the training and experience of the teachers. While some of them only offered rudimentary instruction in Latin or in German or Slovak, others, like the humanist school in Bardejov during the rectorate of Leonard Stöckel, attained an international reputation. By the end of the sixteenth century at least sixteen of the city and eight of the noble schools can be classified as gymnasiums or higher Latin schools while by 1640 nearly 70 Protestant schools in Hungary can be considered to have achieved that status.¹⁵ The records of these schools, as well as of many of the

schools in the smaller towns and some of the villages, had received some university training abroad. Large numbers of students from Hungary, including Slovaks as well as Germans and Magyars, attended universities in Germany. Of the one thousand students from Hungary who matriculated at the university of Wittenberg during the sixteenth century, 360 were from Slovakia.¹⁶ The school established by Gregor Hovráth-Stanšič, who had attended Strasbourg, in his castle at Strážky was one of the more important noble schools for Slovaks and became one of the citadels of Lutheran orthodoxy in Slovakia. Unfortunately, no school order or plan of studies has yet been located for any of the castle or village schools. However, the scanty documentary evidence available does seem to indicate that their school masters were influenced by the same pedagogical concerns and followed the approach of their colleagues in the evangelical humanist schools established in the cities of Upper Hungary.

The cities were the first centers of the Reformation in Slovakia. In them its course and the changes it wrought, particularly in the area of education, can be most readily identified and documented. The texts of several Protestant school orders and disciplinary regulations have been preserved. They reflect the strong influence of the educational program of the Lutheran reformation and especially of Melanchthon, Sturm and Trotzendorf upon the pedagogues in Slovakia. While the oldest preserved school order is Matthias Freundt's 1566 verbatim copy of the Zweibruecken-Neuberg order used in Banská Bystrica, the most systematic and extensive is the one prepared by John Mylius from Jihlava for the city school in Levoča in 1589. As had John Haunold, who compiled in 1587 a school order for Banská Štiavnica, Mylius used as his model the order prepared by Peter Vincentius from Wroclaw (Breslau) which was itself based on one prepared by the latter's mentor, Valentin Trotzendorf for Goldberg. Among the disciplinary regulations preserved the oldest is that prepared by Leonard Stöckel for Bardejov. It was based upon the Eisleben order compiled by Johann Agricola and Herman Tulich, reflecting the three-class model recommended by Melanchthon in his instructions for the Saxon visitation of 1528. Stöckel's regulations were also adapted for use in Kežmarok and Prešov.¹⁷

The pedagogical influence of these and other German school orders upon those in Slovakia clearly indicates that by the second half of the sixteenth century the theology of the Lutheran Reformation and Evangelical humanist pedagogy was well grounded in Slovakia. While the three class or division model recommended by Melanchthon was initially followed, by the end of the sixteenth century, under the influence of Strum's Strasbourg school order, the number of class divisions had increased, first to five and then, in the larger schools, to nine or even ten as formal classes in Greek, theology and philosophy were added to the curriculum in order to prepare graduates to assume immediately positions as teachers and pastors. The two major goals of education were piety, the inculcation of pure Protestant doctrine and practice, and eloquence, the "artes dicendi, scribendi, et lendi," the art of speaking, writing and reading Latin. As Leonard Stöckel wrote in his *Leges Scholae Bartphensis* in 1540, "Because everything ought to be carried on in the name of God, especially among God's children, since apart from this nothing can prosper, the first concern of a teacher ought to be the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom."¹⁸ Thus, the schools devoted as much attention to the moral and religious formation of their students as they did to instruction in language. However, since "grammar was the doorway to all knowledge" the curricula of these Latin schools was organized grammatically, that is following the accepted humanist pedagogical methods which were intended to lead the students, by precept, example, and imitation, from the rudiments of reading and writing through grammar and rhetoric to the knowledge of dialectic and, finally, theology.

This confessionalization of education in Slovakia was accompanied by a laicization of the supervision and administration of the schools. Even before the new school orders were drawn up, the influence of the Reformation was manifested in the transformation of the older parish and cloister trivial schools into town or city schools supported and directly administered by laymen. Starting during the second quarter of the sixteenth century, the responsibility for financing and supervising the schools was exercised either by city or town councils or by individual nobles. These laymen claimed the right to appoint the rector and to supervise his activities, as well as those of any private teachers; they approved the school

orders and disciplinary regulations; they assessed and provided for the material needs of the school and its personnel; and they appointed or served as school visitors or examiners.¹⁹

Thus, by the end of the sixteenth century the schools of Slovakia had school orders based upon those utilized by Lutheran schools or territories in Germany, they were administered and supported by Lutheran councils or nobles, and they employed Lutheran teachers who used both classic humanist and Lutheran texts or materials which they themselves had written. Not that this transformation had come easily. After mid-century, the Lutherans of Slovakia were challenged not only by post-Tridentine Catholicism and the entry of the Jesuits into Slovakia, but also by the spread of Reformed doctrines, especially those of Bullinger and the Second Helvetic Confession.

Mikuláš Oláh, the Primate of Hungary, a learned humanist, and an industrious administrator, realized that the Reformation was becoming a popular movement in Slovakia. He was convinced that the defense of the Roman Catholic faith was possible only if it adopted and adapted the methods of education effectively employed by the Evangelicals. He therefore set out to increase the discipline and moral character of priests and to improve their education by strengthening existing schools and establishing new ones. In Trnava, to which the Archbishop Paul Varadi had transferred his episcopal court in 1543 after the fall of Buda and Esztergom to the Turks, Oláh began his work of reorganization of Catholic education.²⁰ In 1554, with the agreement of the city council, he combined the administration of the local city school and the chapter school which had come with the episcopal bureaucracy to Trnava and prepared for it a plan of studies in the decree "Concerning the reform of the Trnava School." This situation lasted only several years and in 1558 Oláh placed the school completely under the administration of the chapter. Thus while the administrator of the school was the canonical lector, the actual educational director of the six-class school was the sub-rector who was empowered to appoint two teachers, one who spoke Slovak, the other German, and to engage a cantor for instruction in music.

The Emperor and Hungarian King, Ferdinand I, not only provided materially for the well-being of the school by granting it ec-

clesiastical benefices, he also approved the request of Oláh and Diego Laynez Lainer, the general superior of the Jesuit order, to found a Jesuit school in Trnava which was opened in 1561. However, this Jesuit academy lasted only six years and foundered as a result of the plague, fire, and the opposition of the local magistrates and pastor. Some of the community transferred their activities to Šála nad Váhom where they established a three-class Latin School. While other Catholic schools existed in Komárno, Nové Zámky, Zvolen and in Bratislava, the majority of the schools in Slovakia were and remained Protestant until the seventeenth century.

The revival of post-Tridentine Catholicism was not the only challenge which confronted the Protestant schools. Within the Lutheran communities of eastern Slovakia confessional controversies raged for the last two decades of the century which were a manifestation of the influence of Reformed theology to which the majority of Magyar Protestants adhered. These debates focused on the acceptance of the Book of Concord as the norm of Lutheran teaching and, therefore, also a struggle for the control of the schools and for education. During these confessional controversies Slovaks, among them Severinus Sculteti and Eliáš Láni, who had received almost all of their education in Slovakia, began to emerge as major theological and ecclesiastical leaders within the Lutheran movement in Slovakia. This growing influence of Slovaks can also be seen in the elections of seniors at the synods of Žilina (1610) and Spišské Podhradie (1614), which established legally recognized ecclesiastical seniorats for the Lutherans in Slovakia.²¹ By the dawn of the seventeenth century Slovaks comprised the majority of the membership of the Lutheran Church in Slovakia and an increasing proportion of the pastors and teachers were of Slovak origin. These would be joined, especially after the battle of White Mountain of 1620, by a significant number of émigrés from the Czech lands who sought refuge in Hungary, among them the hymnodist Juraj Tranovský, and the noted educator Ján Amos Komenský (Comenius), whose pansophic philosophy and pedagogical ideas had considerable impact in middle Europe.

This influx of émigrés enriched the life of the schools and the Protestant communities in Slovakia and, at the same time, created

some difficulties for them since it contributed to and accentuated already existing confessional disputes or tensions. Especially significant for the Slovak-speaking Lutherans was the increasing availability of publications in Czech or Slovakized Czech which served their worship and devotional needs. In addition to the translation of Luther's Small Catechism, published in Bardejov in 1581, and the catechism of Ján Pruno-Frašťacký (1583) and Daniel Pribiš (1634), the devotional life of Slovak-speaking Lutherans was enriched by the hymn collection of Juraj Tranovský, published in Levoča in 1636. Together with the translation of the Bible produced by the Unitas Fratrum in Moravia at the end of the sixteenth century, the so-called "Kralice Bible," these publications served the private and public worship and devotional needs of Slovak-speaking Lutherans.²²

While Protestant schools continued to be established or improved during the first half of the seventeenth century, they were confronted with significant challenges which increased substantially after mid-century despite the provisions of the Peace of Linz of 1645 which guaranteed religious freedom in Hungary. The level of instruction in many of the schools was quite high. The rectors and teachers often received their university training abroad. This brought them into contact with the prevailing academic and cultural currents of thought. Some were also quite accomplished and widely recognized scholars. Among these were Eliáš Ladiver, Izák Caban, Ján Duchoň and Ján Bayer to mention but a few.²³ The number of scholarly and culturally significant works published in Hungary or abroad by the teachers active in Slovakia also grew substantially during the seventeenth century. From presses in Levoča and Bardejov came several editions of works by Comenius including his *Janua Linguae Latinae*, an innovative, illustrated textbook for learning Latin.²⁴ However, the Lutherans lacked a university of their own in Slovakia and the quality of their schools was still quite diverse and dependent both on the financial commitment of their patrons and the training and experience of their rectors.²⁵

To be sure, attempts were made by the Lutherans in Slovakia to resolve their internal difficulties. During the 1550's and 1560's proposals were made to establish a unified school order but, aside from the approval of texts, little was accomplished. Moreover, after the Synod of Žilina in 1610, despite the support of Juraj Thurzo

and Gašpar Illesházy, the Lutherans were unable to establish their own academy or university during the first half of the seventeenth century. During the second half of the century, the Latin school in Prešov was reorganized as a college according to the suggestion of Ján Bayer while other schools added additional advanced courses in both philosophy and theology. Despite these and other modifications to the curricula of the Lutheran schools, including the gradual acceptance of some of the pedagogical principles of Comenius, they continued to lose ground to the forces of the Counter-Reformation in Slovakia.²⁶

During the first half of the seventeenth century the work anticipated by Mikuláš Oláh was carried on by his even more remarkable successor, the Hungarian Jesuit Peter Pázmány. He emerged as a major figure in the years following the Peace of Vienna in 1606 which granted Protestants religious toleration in Hungary. Pázmány was untiring in his opposition to the Reformation movement. His energy, combined with intellectual acuity and powerful connections, brought about the re-introduction of the Jesuit order into Hungary, despite the opposition of many of the nobility and cities.

In 1615 Pázmány re-established the Jesuit academy or college in the Dominican cloister in Trnava as a three-class school. After receiving a dispensation which released him from his order, Pázmány became Archbishop and in this capacity set about establishing a Catholic university in Hungary. In 1635 he received approval to found a university in Trnava which would have, as one of its chief functions, combatting the spread of Protestantism and the fostering of Catholic doctrine and practice. The school was open to students of all faiths and instruction was without charge. It was organized according to the Jesuit program of education set down in the *Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Jesu* issued by the general superior of the order, Claudius Aquaviva, in 1599. That this educational model was congruent with the program of studies advocated by the Evangelical Sturm in Strasbourg is understandable. The "Ratio" was based upon the educational ideas and programs of Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus, who had been a contemporary of Sturm at Louvain and Paris.²⁷

The Jesuit system of education, as established by the "Ratio,"

was divided into two categories: the "studia inferiora" or lower school, which corresponded to the grammar or Latin schools of the cities, and the "studia superiora" or higher studies, which was equivalent to university training. While the lower schools, which were open to all, were divided into five classes or grades which took between five and seven years to complete, the upper division or university level was divided into two levels, the general philosophical or liberal arts program and finally, the highest level, the study of theology. While the philosophy program lasted three years, those who wished to study theology completed at least four years of study and then, if a doctorate in theology was desired, an additional two years. The goal of this Jesuit educational system was piety and eloquence, the same as it had been for the Evangelical humanists of the sixteenth century. It was designed to achieve specific religious purposes and to serve as an agency for Catholic Reformation and to counter the spread of the Protestant Reformation. However, unlike other traditional universities, the Jesuit school at Trnava did not have a faculty of medicine or of law. The same program of studies was followed by Benedikt Kisdy, Bishop of Eger, who in 1657 organized a "studium generale" or university in Košice.²⁸

While these higher educational institutions were in the hands of the Jesuits, the Piarists were active, especially after the mid-seventeenth century, in establishing lower or basic schools which they founded or established in formerly Lutheran schools whose patrons had converted to Catholicism, or which were taken from the non-Catholics by force. The members of these orders proved to be effective educators and even adopted many of the same methods and materials which had been employed by the Protestants in their schools. The influence and excellence of the Jesuit and Piarist schools combined, after mid-century, with open persecution and military force, to bring about a substantial decline in the number of Lutheran schools in Slovakia.

In addition, the re-conversion of many of the higher nobility to Catholicism, the rebellions of Thököly and Rákóci, the Wesselényi conspiracy and the growing power of the Habsburgs, who successfully campaigned against the Turks following the second siege of Vienna in 1683, together combined to create both the Habsburgs

alliance with the Counter-Reformation and the peculiar Catholic Baroque culture in southeast central Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This effective alliance substantially reduced the number of Evangelicals in Hungary and led to a decline in the number and quality of the Lutheran schools in Slovakia. According to Ján Rezik, from the more than seventy Protestant schools in Hungary which could be considered gymnasiums in 1640, only 10 possessed that character at the dawn of the eighteenth century. Many of the former Evangelical city schools were taken from the Lutherans or lost their gymnasial character and became grammar schools.

Even though fewer in number and much constrained, Lutheran schools continued to function in Slovakia and to provide Slovaks with training both in the classical languages and in Lutheran doctrine and to prepare their students for university study, most often at universities in Germany or elsewhere in western and northern Europe. This meant that the graduates of these schools in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, like their sixteenth and seventeenth century predecessors, would become well acquainted with the broad intellectual currents of the day including the Enlightenment principles which fostered the national awakening of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. On the other hand, although they were co-creators of the peculiar Baroque culture of the Austrian Habsburg lands, the Catholic schools also actively cultivated the use of the Slovak language as part of the program of education and thereby also contributed to the eventual codification of Slovak as a literary language and the creation of a Slovak intelligentsia. Thus, Lutheran and Catholic schools made it possible for a broad cross-section of the population, including many ethnic Slovaks, to gain an education and enter public life. During the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries these schools were among the chief agencies which aided the social and cultural advancement of the Slovaks.

Although the development of Protestant and Catholic popular education in Slovakia during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries helped to create a Slovak intelligentsia and thereby laid the foundations for the Slovak cultural and literary revival of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it also created substan-

tial problems for the subsequent history of the Slovaks. The Slovak intelligentsia and the population were divided into two, often very hostile groups, Protestants and Catholics. Their education, historical development, traditions, and even their cultural awareness and perceptions of Slovak history were quite different. These differences would be manifested in the history of the Slovaks and Slovakia. The continuing heritage of the educational reform of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and the broader cultural and social changes these effected were evident not only during the period of the national cultural revival, but also in the subsequent attempts to foster an ethnic solidarity and a common political consciousness among the Slovaks in the struggle to define and create a Slovak nation and state.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Ľudovít Holotík and Ján Tibenský, *Dejiny Slovenska I* (Bratislava, 1961), pp. 380-392, 456-478; Pavol Mazák, Mikuláš Gašparík, Pavol Petrus and Milan Pišút, *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry 2* (Bratislava, 1984), pp. 9-86; Ján Hučko, *Sociálne zloženie a pôvod slovenskej obrodenskej inteligencie* (Bratislava, 1974).

² Contemporary scholars are debating whether or not Reformation schools were successful, a debate which focuses on the question of whether or not an improvement in individual and/or public morality is the best standard by which the success or failure of the Reformation is to be ascertained. Some, like Gerald Strauss, conclude that the Reformation schools failed because they did not effect a fundamental improvement in or transformation of the moral lives of their graduates. Others, however, question the use of the hermeneutical principle of moral transformation as a standard for judging the success of the Reformation as a historical, ecclesiastical and theological movement. They argue that observable changes in theological formulations, liturgical practices, ecclesiastical institutions and cultural development are more effective means to evaluate the impact of the Reformation. See especially Gerald Strauss, *Luther's House of Learning. Indoctrination of the Young in the German Reformation* (Baltimore, 1976); James M. Kittelson, "Successes and Failures of the German Reformation: The Report from Strasbourg," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 73 (1982) and also his "The Confessional Age: The Late Reformation in Germany" pages 361-381 in *Reformation Europe: A Guide to Research* edited by Steven Ozment (St. Louis, 1982); Leif Grane (Ed.), *University and Reformation: Lectures from the University of Copenhagen Symposium* (Leiden, 1981). Also very useful is the older work of Georg Mertz, *Das Schulwesen der deutschen Reformation im 16. Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1902), and of Friedrich Paulson, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts*

auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitäten vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart (Leipzig, 1919).

- ³ For a brief discussion of contemporary research questions see James D. Tracy, "Humanism and the Reformation," pages 33-57 in *Reformation Europe: a Guide to Research*. A very useful collection of essays on the various aspects of Humanism is *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy*, 3 volumes, Edited by Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia, 1988). See also *Humanizmus a renesancia na Slovensku v. 15. - 16. storočí* edited by Ľudovít Holotík and Anton Van-tuch (Bratislava, 1967) which contains several excellent essays touching on humanism and education in Slovakia.
- ⁴ The role of printing in the spread of the Reformation is another topic of great interest to contemporary Reformation historians. See especially Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (New York, 1983); Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Lay Culture and the Culture of the Learned: Books, Men and Ideas in Strasbourg, 1480-1599* (New Haven, 1982); Richard Crofts, "Books, Reform and the Reformation," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 71 (1980): 21-35; Richard Cole, "The Reformation in Print: German Pamphlets and Propaganda," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 66 (1975): 93-102; and Louise W. Holborn, "Printing and the Growth of a Protestant Movement in Germany from 1517 to 1524," *Church History* 11 (1942): 123-137.
- ⁵ See especially Heinz Scheible, "Melanchthons Beziehungen zum Donau-Karpaten-Rum bis 1546," pages 36-67 in *Luther und Siebenbürgen*, Siebenbürgisches Archiv 19, edited by George and Renate Weber (Köln, 1985); William Toth, "Highlights of the Hungarian Reformation," *Church History* 9 (1940):141-156, and also his "Luther's Frontier in Hungary," pages 75-91 in *Reformation Studies, Essays in Honor of Roland H. Bainton*, edited by Franklin H. Littell (Richmond, 1972); R.J. W. Evangs, "Calvinism in East Central Europe, Hungary and Her Neighbors," pages 167-196 in *International Calvinism, 1541-1717*, edited by Menna Prestwich (Oxford, 1985); and William Hammer, "Latin Instruction in the Schools of Transylvania from the Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century," *The Phoenix* 8 (1954):92-108.
- ⁶ The literature on education in Hungary as a whole and on Slovakia in particular owes a great deal to several older works including the compilation of material gathered during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by Ján Rezik and Samuel Matthaëides, *Gymnaziológia, Dejiny Gymnázii na Slovensku*, edited by Vladislav Ružička (Bratislava, 1971). Also extremely useful is Vilmos Frankl (Fraknói), *A hazai és külföldi iskolázás a XVI században* (Budapest, 1873). A recent general survey was published by Josef Mátej et al. *Dejiny Českej a Slovenskej Pedagogiky* (Bratislava, 1976). For the era of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation the following three works are indispensable: Peter Vajcík, *Školstvo, študijne a školské poriadky na Slovensku v XVI storočí* (Bratislava, 1955); István Mészáros, *XVI. századi városi iskoláink és a "studia humanitatis"*, *Humanizmus és Reformáció*, 11 (Budapest, 1981); and Vladislav Ružička, *Školstvo na Slovensku v období neskorého feudalizmu* (Bratislava, 1974) which draws much from Rezik's

Gymnaziológia but also provides many extensive and useful annotations. For individual schools especially helpful are: János Breznyi, *A Selmechánya agost. hitv. evang. egyház és lyzeum története* (Selmechányán, 1883); Ján Gallo, *Dejiny stredných škôl v Gemeri do polovici 19. storočia* (Martin, 1977); József Hörk, *Az eperjesi ev. ker. collegium története* (Kassa, 1896); Pavol Križko, *Kremnické školstvo v rokoch 1527-1674* (Bratislava, 1975); Johann Liptak, *Geschichte des evangelischen Lyzeums A.B. in Kesmark, 400 Jahre* (Kežmarok, 1933); and Ján Mikleš, "Dejiny školstva v Banskej Bystrici mestská latinská škola" *Jednotná škola* 10 (1955):308-343. See also his "Obrázky z dejín školstva na počiatku reformácie v Banskej Bystrici. Dokumenty k dejinám mestskej školy v Banskej Bystrici v 16. storočí" pp. 53-84 and "Význam pokrokovej tradície bystrických školských zákonov z roku 1617 a ich súvislosť s komenského učebnicami v Kremnici a v Banskej Bystrici" pp. 85-106 in *Sborník vyššej pedagogickej školy v Banskej Bystrici* (Banská Bystrica, 1958).

⁷ For a concise review of the evidence concerning education in Slovakia during the high middle ages see Pavol Križko, *Kremnické školstvo v rokoch 1526-1674*. (Bratislava, 1975), pp. 10-18.

⁸ Julius Sopko, "O školstve a vzdelanosti na Slovensku v stredoveku" *Historický časopis* 36 (1968):175-197.

⁹ Peter Vajcik, "Nižšie školstvo na Slovensku v 15.-16. storočí," in Holotík and Vantuch, pp. 118-127 and Mátej, pp. 51-53.

¹⁰ See Vajcik, *Školstvo*, pp. 7-13.

¹¹ Ivan Chalupický, "Vzdelanosť a Kultúra spišských miest a mestečiek v 15.-18. storočí" *Historický časopis* 35 (1987):427-435.

¹² See especially the following articles in Holotík and Vantuch: Branislav Varsik, "Slovensko a európska vzdelanosť v 15.-16. storočí," pp. 128-135; František Kavda, "Slovenští studenti na pražské universitě v 15. a 16. století," pp. 137-146; Endre Kovács, "Vzt'ahy krakovskej univerzity k Slovensku za renesancie," pp. 147-161; Pavel Horváth, "Študenti zo Slovenska na krakovskej univerzite v 15. a v prvej polovici 16. storočia," pp. 162-172; and Matúš Kučera, "Študenti zo Slovenska na viedenskej univerzite do r. 1530," pp. 173-188.

¹³ Tibor Kardos, "Devotio Moderna na Academii Istropolitana," pages 25-39 in Holotík and Vantuch. Adalbert Hudak, "Der Hofprediger Johannes Henckel und seine Beziehungen zu Erasmus von Rotterdam," *Kirche im Osten* 2 (1959):106-133; Gustav Bauch, "Dr. Johann Henckel, der Hofprediger der Königin Maria von Ungarn," *Ungarische Revue* 4 (1884):559-627; Ján Kvačala, "Kráľovná Mária a jej účasť v dejoch reformácie" *Viera a veda* 1 (1930):10-22, 59-72, 97-105.

¹⁴ Vajcik, *Školstvo* pp. 10-24; Rezik and Matthaeides; Ružička, pp. 34-71.

¹⁵ See Ružička, Rezik and Matthaeides, and Frankl. The statistics are to be considered minimum figures since they only take into account schools for which written evidence currently exists.

-
- ¹⁶ Geza Szábo, *Geschichte des Ungarischen Coetus and der Universität Wittenberg, 155-1613* (Halle, 1941).
- ¹⁷ Vajcik, *Školstvo*, pp. 59-135; Ružička, pp. 72-123. See also Friedrich Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts I*, 3rd Ed. (Berlin and Leipzig, 1919) for a general introduction to school reforms in the German states during the era of the Reformation.
- ¹⁸ Vajcik, *Školstvo*, p. 61.
- ¹⁹ Vajcik, *Školstvo*, pp. 15-24.
- ²⁰ *Tŕnavská Univerzita v slovenských dejinách*. Edited by Viliam Čičaj and Vladimír Matula (Bratislava, 1987).
- ²¹ David P. Daniel, "The Acceptance of the Formula of Concord in Slovakia," *Archive für Reformationsgeschichte* 70 (1979):160-277.
- ²² David P. Daniel, "The Protestant Reformation and Slovak Ethnic Consciousness," *Slovakia*, 28 (1978-1979):49-65.
- ²³ For brief biographical sketches see *Slovenský Biografický Slovník* vols. 1-3 (Martin, 1986-1989).
- ²⁴ In 1643 Valentine Brewer printed his first edition of the *Janua Linguae Latinae*. It was quickly followed by printings in 1644, 48, 49 and again in 1655. See Ján Čaplovič, *Bibliografia Tlačí vydaných na Slovensku do roku 1700*. I (Martin, 1972), nos. 896, 906, 938, 957, 958, 1012.
- ²⁵ *Prešovské kolégium v slovenských dejinách*, edited by Imrich Sedlák (Košice, 1967).
- ²⁶ František Bokes, "Rozvoj vyššieho školstva na Slovensku v 17.-19. storočí," in *Prešovské kolégium*, p. 13.
- ²⁷ Ružička, p. 126.
- ²⁸ Ružička, pp. 125-169.

Learning and Education in Slovakia during the late 17th and 18th centuries

EVA KOWALSKA

(Translated by David P. Daniel)

"*Inter arma silent Musae.*" (Among arms, the muses are silent). At the dawn of the sixteenth century, Slovakia was at one of the major crossroads of its development. The peasant uprising led by Juraj Dóža in 1514 initiated the process of re-feudalization which strengthened manorial relationships in agriculture, the main sphere of economic life. After the battle of Mohács in 1526 the expanding influence and military might of the Turks made of the southern region of Slovakia, in particular, the scene of military clashes which lasted for nearly one and a half centuries. Another complication was the power struggle between the Habsburgs and the Hungarian nobility which did not end with the successful assertion, by the Habsburgs, of their claims to the Hungarian throne. The resistance of the Hungarian nobility took the form of a rebellion and an insurrection of the estates. It occurred largely on the territory of Slovakia, which, during the time of the Turkish occupation, represented the remnant and nucleus of the Hungarian kingdom. It might seem then, that societal conflicts and both international and domestic struggles for political power would lead to the decline of culture and education in Slovakia, that it inaugurated, in the true sense of the word, "*doba temna*," a time of darkness. However, as the results of the most recent historical research demonstrate, this did not happen.¹ On the contrary, Slovakia, and especially its most important cities, remained centers

of high culture which was enriched by internal and external influences.

The royal free and mining cities represented the most economically significant type of city in which were concentrated manufacture and trade, often oriented towards foreign markets.² These cities had at their disposal extensive rights which gave them a certain ability to counter the preponderant influence of the nobility. Although affected by the gradual depletion of the sources of their economic prosperity, their extensive tax obligations and the need to maintain alliances in the war against the Turks, their favored position was strengthened by the integration of the citizenry and their class consciousness and allegiance. One of the fundamental characteristics of municipalities was that they maintained schools for which they possessed the right of patronage. Among the several ambitions of the cities was the desire to establish the highest type of school possible and to employ recognized pedagogues. It is possible that these tendencies fostered the accompanying manifestations of secularization and laicization. Behind these, however, stood the adoption of the Reformation movement which, in a decisive manner, influenced education in Slovakia. Schools became for the Protestant churches the "*conditio sine qua non*" of their existence and broadened their social influence. This goal was evident among all social strata, even that of the villages. It not only spread among the ranks of the children who completed the various levels of instruction but also changed the attitudes of individual social classes toward the question of the maintenance of schools. Many landlords, moreover, especially from the ranks of the higher nobility, founded and supported schools on their property.³ On the other hand, church congregations in small towns and villages were also obliged to maintain an appropriate type of school.

The spread of the Reformation, together with the development of education, supported the development of book culture in all its aspects — the printing and sale of books, the founding of libraries, and the development of literature. During the sixteenth century several cities became important centers of printing and the book trade. An increasingly greater proportion of the citizenry appears to have had its own extensive libraries. Some individuals built up their collections with an eye toward their professional activities.

For example, on the basis of information provided by last wills and testaments, we know that twenty-eight libraries with 1,182 volumes existed in the chief mining cities of Banská Bystrica, Banská Štiavnica and Kremnica. The number of libraries in the following era increased sharply. There is evidence available from the seventeenth century that in the 215 libraries of individual citizens in these cities there were 9,173 books.⁴

The development of schools in Slovakia, stimulated by the Reformation, was not, however, unambiguous and straightforward. It was marked by two decisive, determining factors: the inauguration and successful completion of re-Catholicization, and the assumption of the supervision of education by the state. The peculiar internal conditions in Slovakia made it possible, in contrast to Bohemia, for a certain number of Protestant churches and schools to function. But, on the whole, the picture of education after the mid-seventeenth century changed dramatically. Using means similar to those employed by the Reformers, who propagated their ideas through school and church, the aggressive re-Catholicizers also used, with special effectiveness, military intervention. Its result was the renewal of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and of the network of Catholic schools in Slovakia.

The question of the free development of education thus became a slogan and demand of contemporary Protestants who were drawn into the anti-Habsburg revolt of the estates led by František Rákoczi. The final regulations of the diet which met in Šopron in 1681 limited the number of Protestant schools and churches to two "articular places" in each county, places specified in the articles approved by the Diet. In 1731, the "Resolutio Carolina" further restricted the Protestants. The few schools which the Protestants were allowed to maintain could only be lower, grammar schools and these could not teach, in their higher grades, the humanities, philosophy or theology. Protestant education was on the defensive and lost the means of free development. Whether Catholic or Protestant, the confessionalization of education brought with it an interior paralysis both in the area of the content and method of education. Aristotelian scholasticism became a boundary which limited the process of modernization.

However, already in the seventeenth century, attempts to over-

come these limitations were made, especially in the Protestant schools, by the introduction of new methods of instruction and by the broadening of the content of education. Therefore, the way to the "Resolutio Carolina" was limited, on the one hand, by the contradictory development of Protestant education, and, on the other hand, by the success of the power of the Catholic state and the ecclesiastical hierarchy. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, previously important Lutheran schools had ceased to exist including those at Krupina, Trenčín, Pezinok, and Svätý Jur. Many schools were transformed from gymnasiums (grammar schools) into two or three-class elementary schools, as occurred in Kremnica in 1674 or Banská Štiavnica in 1735. This meant that the rebirth and flowering of Evangelical education had to wait until the last two decades of the eighteenth century.

However, many of these schools, despite their difficult fate, continued to play an important role in the history of education in Slovakia and had a vibrant influence upon the creation and development of a Slovak intelligentsia. It is necessary to mention, in the first place, the Evangelical college in Prešov.⁵ This collegium, which never was a true "high school" or university, was active as the highest type of Lutheran school in Hungary only for three short periods, 1667-1672, 1682-1687, and 1704-1711. Its development, curricula and the activities of its individual professors show, however, that it certainly had the ambition to become such an institution.

The Latin school in Prešov had already reached a high level of instruction, thanks to the rectors Lukáš Fabiny, Ján Bocatius, Jakub Jacobaeus, Ján Bühringer, Ján Matthaides and especially, Ján Bayer. The last mentioned prepared in 1664 a suggestion for the reorganization of the Latin school in Prešov. In it he tried to transform the content and form of instruction in conformity to and as a practical application of the "new philosophy" contained in the works of Francis Bacon.⁶ His concept of education was that it should emphasize practical knowledge and train a man of action, who would have the ability to discover and rule over nature and his world. Therefore, he emphasized a broad spectrum of philosophical studies which included questions of epistemology, methodology, physics, practical philosophy or ethics, economics and metaphysics. Of equal importance was mathematics, in which, in

contrast to his contemporaries, he also included the study of its applied forms, that is astronomical mathematics, optics, architecture, and mathematical geography.

Bayer's pedagogical plan corresponded with the concepts of Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius) who advocated a broad-based education which went beyond the traditional humanist emphasis upon piety and eloquence, "*pietas et eloquentia*." The realization of this plan, however, was probably restricted by the disputes of Bayer with both the town council and the leading nobility. He certainly wished to win their support for the development of the town and church. But he attacked "the greedy rich and unproductive people, who devote themselves neither to work or study but only to shameful idleness." It is no wonder that his uncompromising attitudes earned him the ill-will of the town council, which had already been discussing the building of a new school. In 1665 Bayer was released from his functions as rector.

Discussions concerning the establishment a new higher school or college had begun, at the instigation of the Lutheran nobility present, at the synod of Prešov. Here, representatives of the Lutheran nobility and the six royal towns of eastern Slovakia decided to abolish the patronage right of the city of Prešov over the city school. They then used the city school as the foundation on which would be established a new school under the supervision of the Lutheran church in eastern Slovakia. The agreement about the legal status of the college, the regulations for the supervisors of the school, its professors and students, were approved on 16 April 1667. Instruction began on 18 October of the same year. A plan of instruction was drawn up for ten classes and included theology, dogmatics, polemics and moral theology (ethics), Latin, Greek and Hebrew, law, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, mathematics, geography, and both general and church history. The graduates, therefore, would be able to enter the clerical or secular professions or go on for further advanced study. The road the students took in pursuing further education led normally toward the university of Wittenberg with which the college continuously maintained close contacts. Even the selection of professors for the college was regularly conducted in consultation with Adam Calovius, a professor at Wittenberg. The relatively numerous

publications of the professors, especially Eliáš Ladiver Jr., Jakub Röser and Izák Caban also contributed to the prestige of the school.⁷

The founding and activity of the college took place during a time when the influence and pressure of the Counter-Reformation was growing. The Habsburgs, especially Leopold I, had as their goal the building of a strong state. They effectively resisted the pressure of the Ottoman Turks and henceforth played a key role in European politics. The strengthening of the power of the ruler (royal absolutism) brought with it the centralization of the administration of the whole monarchy which sought, by force if necessary, to establish uniformity even in the spiritual sphere. Re-Catholicization became a tool in this process. It did not, moreover, extend only to the area of the spiritual life of the population. It was accompanied by a restriction of political and civil rights, the repudiation of ancient privileges, and even military actions as, for example, the so-called Prešov massacre of 1673 and the arrest and persecution of Evangelical pastors and teachers in 1674. One's attachment to a specific ideology was a demonstration of loyalty; violations of the same were considered a dangerous act towards one's superiors.

As they attempted to consolidate a state strong in every respect, significant support was provided to the Habsburg monarchs by the new Counter-Reformation orders of the Jesuits and the Piarists. Both considered education as one of the most important weapons in the struggle against religious opponents. In contrast to the diversity which characterized Lutheran schools, they established a monolithic, detailed, and precisely expounded conception of education and of training in the schools. Their concept did not permit any variations in textbooks, in the interpretation of, or the conclusions drawn from the subject matter. Even though these and other orders, including the Paulinian, Franciscan or Minorite, and Benedictine orders, did not work together directly, thanks to their activity, there developed in Slovakia complete, stable, and relatively widespread system of schools, extending from elementary through secondary or grammar schools to "high schools" (universities).

A quality classical education and the possibility of university study with the Jesuits or an education oriented towards the practical with an emphasis on the exact sciences and the native language

with the Piarists — these became the two kinds of Catholic schools in Slovakia until the time of school reform at the end of the eighteenth century. The academic attraction of these schools was enhanced by the opportunity to study free of charge. The towns with important schools became centers to which students came from far and wide. Ethnic Slovak students predominated at the Jesuit gymnasiums or grammar schools in Trenčín, Trnava, and Skalica, and at those of the Piarists in Prievidza and Nitra. In Nitra a boarding school was founded for pupils from the counties of Trenčín, Orava, Turiec, Liptov, and Spiš. In the urban milieu it became customary to complete at least the lower classes of the Latin school which, to a considerable degree, also served the function of a public elementary school.⁸ The principles of the systematic education of girls were established by the Ursulines and the order of Notre Dame de Namur.⁹

The most significant contribution of the re-Catholicization of the schools for the development of education in Slovakia was, however, the founding of universities. The first opened in Trnava in 1635 and the second in 1667 in Košice.¹⁰ Even if they served, in equal measure, all of the peoples of Hungary, they played an extraordinary role in the creation of the national consciousness, language and literature of the Slovaks.¹¹

The founding of the University at Trnava by Peter Pázmány was the culmination of his extensive organization activity in the field of education. Although the university developed and worked under the administration of the Jesuits, the training of the clergy was not its only goal. Pázmány, although he was originally a member of the Jesuit order, endeavored to secure for the university the direct protection of the sovereign and a partial reduction of the influence of the Jesuits. However, given the conditions in Hungary, he could not count on an effective counterweight to the Jesuits.¹² Trnava was selected as the seat of the university for several reasons. It was not only the site of the already existing boarding school founded by Pázmány, but also had a lower cost of living and a population relatively unaffected by the Reformation. But especially beneficial for the Jesuits was that it was the seat of the cathedral chapter and the residence of the Archbishop of Esztergom.

This assured the Jesuits freedom from city taxes and favorable conditions for acquiring real estate.¹³

The university opened its doors to students of philosophy and theology on 13 November 1635. Instruction in philosophy included lectures in logic, physics, metaphysics, mathematics, ethics, geometry, astronomy, and natural sciences. For young noblemen, the inclusion of Italian, French, dancing and fencing made the curriculum more attractive. In theology the students studied scholastic theology, dogmatics according to Thomas Aquinas, under the direction of two or three professors. A second main subject was casuistry, the special subject of polemics, canon law, the reading and exposition of the Scriptures and Hebrew. Within the framework of the university was included the "studia humaniora" as the highest grades of the Jesuit college, where preparation in classical Latin reached its apex. Although these grades were actually a part of the gymnasium or grammar school, they were identified as part of the philosophical faculty and designated the language faculty, "facultas linguarum."

The university survived in this form until 1667. In comparison with other universities it was not complete. It lacked a faculty of law and of medicine. Until the second half of the seventeenth century the teaching of law at the university was limited to canon and Roman civil law. During this time "domestic" or statutory law had no place in the curriculum. It is not surprising that, given the social conditions of the early seventeenth century, a time of political uncertainty and economic decline, there was no support for, or widespread interest in, the study of this limited branch of law either among the Hungarian nobility or the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The steady growth of the various levels of bureaucratic administration soon made evident, however, the necessity of specialized legal training. The Archbishops of Esztergom, Juraj Lippay and Imrich Lósy, who were generous benefactors of the university, founded and supported a new faculty of law. This "delay" in opening a faculty of law to 2 January 1667 made it possible for that faculty to avoid teaching in this subject the contemporary trends which supported the interest and power of the state. These interests were shifted to the study of Roman law, the scope of which was expanded, and to the new subject of "domestic" or statutory law.

Even though, from the very beginning, the new faculty lectured on canon, Roman and Hungarian law, it is necessary to see the close connection between domestic and broader contemporary currents of thought. Instruction in the faculty was divided into four areas: Roman, canon, Hungarian civil and property law, and Hungarian civil procedural law. The range of statutory law soon was enlarged to encompass further disciplines, for example, criminal law. In this, Trnava surpassed many foreign universities.¹⁴

The university functioned with these three faculties until 1769. At its head stood a Rector, the first of whom was Juraj Dobronoki. He was assisted by a Chancellor whose task was to organize disputes and public presentations, to decide about the bestowal of academic degrees and he also served as the book censor. The work of the faculties was directed by individual deans. The composition of the teaching faculty was affected by the international character of the Jesuit order. There was a large number of foreigners, especially Germans and Italians on the faculty; but the highest proportion were Slavs: Croats, Slovenes, Poles, and Czechs, but Slovaks and Magyars predominated.

No other important changes occurred in the organization of the university until 1735-1744, the beginning of the second century of its existence. That these were anticipated earlier is indicated by a decree of the Provincial of the Jesuit order which prohibited lectures on new philosophical theories, especially those of Descartes and Leibnitz. From 1735 on, however, new subjects of instruction were introduced. The most characteristic Jesuit discipline, casuistry, was transformed into the teaching of moral and pastoral theology. Church history, until then largely disregarded, was introduced largely within the study of rhetoric. Instruction in mathematics, astronomy, and geometry was entrusted to three separate professors. Also introduced was instruction in geography and in the "living" languages of Hungarian and German.

A decisive turning point, the first step in the process of the "nationalization" or secularization of the university, and "de facto", of the whole school system in Hungary, occurred in 1753. In the previous year, the University of Vienna was reorganized and nationalized and this example was immediately followed by all other universities in the monarchy. In Trnava, however, it did not lead

to total state control of the faculty but did substantially alter the pattern of instruction. Study in the philosophical faculty was reduced to two years and the number of professors reduced to three, one each for logic and metaphysics, physics and ethics, and mathematics. It also changed the method of obtaining academic degrees. Public, formal disputes were replaced by difficult tests and the title of Master of Philosophy was abolished. Professors had to prepare texts for their own subjects in order to end the practice of dictating subject matter and to improve the level of instruction. Thanks to these changes, during the course of the next few years, the professors at Trnava published many texts. Moreover, in 1756 an astronomical observatory, designed by Maximilian Hell, was opened and equipped with the most modern instruments.

The introduction of modern science and thought was anticipated in the work of Martin Szentivány (1633-1705) as rector of the university. In his extensive work, "*Miscellanea scientiarum*" he expressly employed a combination of empiricism and logic to support a differentiation among the competence of theology, metaphysics and natural philosophy. After the rectorship of Szentivány, during the course of the next several decades, both Cartesian and Newtonian mechanics were used for the exposition of natural phenomena as, for example, in the text book "*Statica*" published in 1740 by Michal Lipsciz. Others, among them Adányi, Jaslinský, Revický, Ivančič, Makó and Radič, whose textbooks were issued after 1753, did not consider it necessary even to mention the differences between Newton and Descartes. In epistemology, theological presuppositions were consistently ignored and a distinction was clearly made between the problems of philosophy and those of physics. Copernicus and Newton became the fundamental authorities for interpreting the natural world.

At the university experiments were used both in the instructional process and for individual scientific work, especially in astronomy. The well-equipped observatory guaranteed precise measurements. Professor F. Weiss and his assistant, J. Šajnovič and F. Taucher, issued the results of their observations in their own journal, "*Observationes astronomicae*." In the observatory there was also a chemical laboratory and a physics collection. The physics

textbook of Ján Baptist Horváth in 1767 was issued in several domestic and foreign editions.

A change as significant as that experienced by the philosophical faculty during the mid-eighteenth century also occurred in the faculty of law. Law faculties in the whole monarchy had to become active assistants in carrying through the political and national goals of the dynasty. Therefore, on 3 November 1760, Maria Theresa issued an order that the law faculty at Trnava had to teach those subjects which were related to the administration of the state. Most important was natural law, the principles of which could be employed to strengthen absolutism. In 1770 political science and international law were added to the curriculum. Martini, Justi and Sonnenfels were employed as the main authorities, as in the Austrian part of the monarchy.

The process of extending state control over the university culminated on 11 November 1769 when Maria Theresa issued regulations which placed the university under her special protection. The administration of the faculty was entrusted, as in Vienna, to appointed directors. A second result of these regulations was the creation of a faculty of medicine.¹⁵ This step was not only an immediate reaction to the acute lack of physicians in Hungary, but also contributed to the high technical level of education. In Hungary this trend had already emerged in 1762 in the organization of the mining academy in Banská Štiavnica and, in the following year, in the "Collegium oeconomicum" in Senec which was a technical school for preparing officials for state and commerce.

The distribution and number of professors in medicine, five in number, approached European standards. The high quality of the faculty was underscored by the work of the well-known specialists Josef Plenck in the chair of surgery, Jakub Winterl in botany and chemistry, and Adam Trnka in anatomy. All were disciples of Gerhard van Swieten. To an equal degree the faculty contributed to the formation of public hygiene by training midwives and pharmacists as well as doctors.

The cultural importance of the university was not limited to the preparation of specialists in various areas of study. While the intellectual life of the Slovak nation was not confined to Trnava during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the contributions

that the university made to it were considerable. The University contributed to the formation of written Slovak, the ideology of the Slovak nation and to the strengthening of Slovak national consciousness. These processes were connected with the work of the professors who, as in the historical works of Szentivány and Samuel Timon, contributed to the building up of a historical consciousness as an important component of the national ideological program.

An important role was played, moreover, by the university press which helped to develop norms for the Slovak language.¹⁶ In the years 1648-1779 it published more than three million volumes of 4,915 titles of which 257 titles were in Slovak. Slovak editors gave the Slovak language a cultivated form which, already at this time, differed from that used by the Slovak Lutherans. It was spread among the people of Slovakia through its use in official orders and especially for religious literature. It played both a communicative and a unifying role. This written Slovak codified the western Slovak cultural language. Through polemical literature and multi-language dictionaries used in both Catholic and Lutheran schools it also influenced the language used by the Lutherans. The importance of the press grew even more after all the Catholic schools were taken over by the state in 1773 and by the school reform of 1777, the "*Ratio educationis*." The university press was oriented toward the publication of textbooks. In the years 1773 to 1783 alone 89,450 books used in the primary public schools were published. Of these nearly half or 41,950 volumes were editions of the eight Slovak titles published.

The reform of the university of Trnava and the formation of higher technical schools anticipated the process of the nationalization of the whole school system which culminated during the 1770s. The suppression of the Jesuit order also signified a fundamental turning point in the realization of the plan of school reform. An essential difference, in contrast to the past, was the strict division between the elementary level and the middle level of education by a more precise definition of their scope and relationship. Expressly employed was the concept of the utility of education. It was manifested in the content of instruction and in the preferential treatment accorded the technical and public primary schools at the expense of the middle schools. In general, for the first time, attention was given to the education of apprentices and girls and

to the determination of the content of elementary instruction. Academies were established with similar goals. They rounded out the system of schools in Hungary and provided professional training for those who had completed their studies at a gymnasium or grammar school. This included, naturally, the preparation of teachers who would serve in the public schools, including primary schools.¹⁷

This utilitarian attitude corresponded to the Enlightenment conception of the state and the organization of society.¹⁸ The physiocrats viewed the working classes as the primary component of the population which created the major part of the wealth of the state. They were, however, assigned a passive role. They had to be instruments in the hands of the well-organized state. In the spirit of the Enlightenment, the main goal of the state was to secure the "public good." It was to provide its population with appropriate conditions which would enable the population to fulfill its function. This required, of course, at least a fundamental education. The population had to be prepared to function as future "citizens" and, at the same time, to know what they could expect from the state. The state considered, therefore, that it had the responsibility, to a certain degree, of "enlightenment," that is, to provide its population with an understanding of citizenship. In this, the schools were considered as important an agency as religion. Here it is possible to see the beginning of the process of emancipation in which the schools gradually were freed from their subordination to the church. This Enlightenment tendency was, however, within a short time, slowed down by a renewed strengthening of the position of the church vis-à-vis the school.

The assumption of the supervision of schools by the state can be considered as an essential characteristic of Enlightenment education. The beginning of this process was characterized by an encroachment into the organizational structure of education in the form of the general approval of school orders. In the Austrian part of the monarchy they were prepared for individual types of schools. In Hungary, this was attempted as a whole in the form of the "Ratio educationis" of 1777.¹⁹

The "Ratio educationis" contained all of the main principles of the Enlightenment understanding of education. Its authors,

among them the Slovak Adam František Kollár, extended the task of schools to the building up of the citizenry in society. In harmony with this, ideas conforming to the theory of natural law were presented, on the one hand, with a demand for the extension of education to all social classes and, on the other, with a conscious intent to overcome social, national (ethnic) and confessional barriers. The Ratio implemented the principles of the hierarchy of schools and their administration. The new extent and intent was broader in comparison to the previous situation²⁰ and emphasized the formational aspect of education. The school administration took care to establish prescribed curricula, methods and textbooks for all school. This task was relatively easy in "gymnasium" or "grammar" schools where there were enough texts and teachers.²¹ However, a great number of complex problems had to be resolved in the case of the public school. It required the preparation of a sufficient number of textbooks and educated teachers. Good material conditions for the schools and teachers were an essential condition for the success of the whole reform program, which, after 1777, began a difficult process of extending the network of public schools. It found a relatively good response in the towns where the number of pupils increased rapidly.²²

The attempt to establish a sovereign model for education and the introduction of specific curricula for the various types of schools also affected non-Catholic schools. Within Hungary and its adjacent territories the Lutherans and the Reformed had the right to maintain their own schools. This was not, however, based on the principles of toleration. The Protestant schools were able to function only as a result of complex conflicts with the Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchy and struggles with the secular power and then, only to a limited degree. If the principles of education advocated by the state were to be implemented by the power of the state it was unavoidable that this would lead to conflict with non-Catholics. It was necessary, therefore, to prepare such a model of education which would enable the approval of the principle of toleration. This was, after all, in the interest of the state.

The Lutheran schools in Slovakia were not unaffected by the spreading influence of the Enlightenment. On the contrary, Pietism, of which Matej Bel was one of the chief representatives, was ex-

pressly manifested in several middle schools in Slovakia, especially in Banská Bystrica and Bratislava.²³ The findings of the new science, including pedagogy, spread into Slovakia especially through the number of students who studied abroad.²⁴ Although the "Resolutio Carolina" did not allow for an increase in the number of Lutheran schools or changes in their character, their teachers attempted to include such subjects in their program of instruction which went beyond those allowed by the state. Despite this, non-Catholic schools during the late eighteenth century were characterized by stagnation. This was the result of the social situation of the non-Catholic population, of the possibilities allowed them and the insufficiency of the necessary means for maintaining a high level of instruction in their existing schools. The schools were transitional places for teachers, many of whom were waiting for a clerical position.

Because of this situation, reforms in non-Catholic education were also anticipated in accordance with the goals of the state. One indication of this was the demand for fundamental reforms of elementary education by Gabriel Balašovič in 1749 and the plan for the reform of the middle schools by Juraj Fábry in 1773. The prospects for a general, wide-spread reform of the schools, however, were not great. In contrast to Catholic schools, the Lutheran schools lacked a single supervisory organ which could guarantee a unified administration and the introduction of reform measures. In Slovakia, only in Gemer did the seniorat, or Lutheran pastoral conference, establish an organization of teachers, the "Bratstvo rektorov", in 1741, which considered questions concerning the work of the schools. In such conditions, the issuance of the "Ratio educationis" was a definite milestone also in the development of Lutheran education in Slovakia as well in the whole of Hungary.

The chief difference from the earlier situation was that the question of non-Catholic schools was removed from the jurisdiction of a religious commission. For the first time the "Ratio" proclaimed the assumption by the state of the supervision of education without considerations of confessional allegiance. The non-Catholic schools had to follow the direction of the regional school districts even though the rectors and teachers were installed by the local church

congregation. The school districts resolved problems in the schools with the exception that they could not interfere in religious questions. Approved textbooks were issued for "secular subjects" which had to be acceptable to all the confessions since non-Catholic students could study at all types of schools. It is understandable, however, that since legal toleration was not yet firmly anchored or legally established — the Edict of Toleration would not be issued until nearly five years later — these attempts at implementing the above mentioned principles of educational reform had to meet with a lack of confidence. In individual cases, Lutheran middle schools worked together with the direction of specific school districts, especially in Bratislava, thanks to a leading representative of Enlightenment thought in Hungary, František Balassa. The administration of the Lutheran and Reformed churches as a whole, however, shortly after the issuance of the "Ratio", opposed the attempts of the state to extend its jurisdiction over education.

More important changes, which could be traced back directly to the "Ratio" were realized during the reign of Joseph II (1780-90), when several tendencies, which were only briefly touched upon in the "ratio" were more fully expounded and implemented. The ear of Joseph II was characterized, in the area of education, by a growing centralization and unifying of school organization. In the field of education his reforms not only effected a necessary broadening of the scope of education as, for example, in devoting particular attention to the public schools, but also emphasized practical matters as can be seen in the support of practical schooling and the restrictions placed upon university study.

The most important change in the school system, however, was the resolution of the relationship between church and state in religious questions. With regard to the Catholic church there was established the principle of the subordination of the church to the state. The evidence for this was the foundation of state seminaries for preparing clergy, the abolition both of theological studies within individual orders and of the responsibility of students to participate in the religious ceremonies or life in the schools.

A further, very important, change in the development of schools was the issuance of the Edict of Toleration in 1781. Its greatest significance was in the field of primary education where

it changed the manner of educating non-Catholic children. According to its provisions non-Catholics could establish their own schools in places where there lived at least 100 families and 500 individual non-Catholics. However, the curriculum of the schools thus established had to conform to written regulations, and the population had to provide significant financial support. In addition, the possibility of state control, the economic conditions of the towns and villages and the resources which the highest level of schools required made it advantageous to establish mixed schools.

The idea of the so-called mixed schools, attended by both Catholic and Protestant children was worked out by Gottfried van Swieten, the leader of school policy under Joseph II. It was first implemented on the school district of Bratislava, in Sväty Jur and in the village of Neded. Ferdinand Kigler,²⁵ a co-worker of J.I. Felbiger, also worked to establish mixed schools more widely throughout the country. The pupils in these schools were separated according to their knowledge and not according to their religious confession. Each confession had to employ its own teachers who taught each class as a whole. Religion was taught only by the cantor or catechist in individual congregations. Whereas in the "confessional" schools the clergy had supervisory responsibilities, this was denied them in the so-called "mixed" schools, which were under lay supervisors, one of whom had to be Catholic, another Lutheran. Another important provision concerned the preparation of textbooks from which all that was not acceptable to non-Catholics had to be removed. About seventy mixed schools developed in Slovakia during the 1780s in, for example, Brezno, Krupina, Pukanec, and Sväty Jur.

State schools and, in the first place primary schools, required high financial burdens for the whole population. These were borne not only by local treasuries but also directly by the parents of the pupils and students who had to pay school taxes. Several cities, among them Bardejov, Krupina, Skalica, and Pezinok, felt injured by the abolition of their Latin schools. The question of "Germanization" also negatively influenced the attitudes of the population. Although the use of German, in the view of the state, was an effective instrument for communicating with the whole population, the attempt to mandate its use led to dissatisfaction and did not

conform to actual local situations. Instruction in the German language was mandated even in villages where the peasant population had no interest in or need for it. While in the villages, at least, it was not possible to enforce this provision, because of local circumstances, it eventually was implemented in the case of most of the middle and higher schools. However, this "Germanization" also created opposition to the Josephine reforms. During the 1780s, while this opposition was suppressed by the supporters of reform, after the death of Joseph II the system of state schools was nearly abolished.

The main cause of this development might be seen, in general, in the determined opposition of the Hungarian nobility towards unifying the supervision and administration of both the schools and education. The leading initiators of this opposition were the counties which, already before the death of Joseph II, had opened a campaign against his measures. At a meeting of the counties in 1790 a whole list of grievances was prepared, several of which touched upon the question of the schools and education. A series of pamphlets also appeared attacking state control of education. In these, the chief cause of dissatisfaction was the question of language instruction. Equally important, in light of later developments, were suggestions concerning the organization of schools. The supervision of the schools should be returned to the clergy. The school commission which, under the reforms of Joseph, was responsible for administration, should be confined to advisory functions. This would mean that the Josephine system of school administration, as a whole, would have to be abolished. The highest circles at court and representatives of the school administration defended the view that education was within the purview of the ruler. Only slowly did the counties gain an influence in its supervision.

Another important factor in the disintegration of the Josephine school system was the twenty-sixth article of 1791. This called upon non-Catholics to establish, with the consent of the ruler, different types of schools which would no longer be under the direction of the local school districts. The non-Catholic population naturally welcomed this possibility. In many villages and towns independent Lutheran schools were founded. Lutheran schools in Slovakia,

thanks to this article, thus obtained the possibility of their own free development. A whole series of Lutheran schools reached a high level which rivaled that of the royal academies. Especially significant among these were the Evangelical lycea in Bratislava, Kežmarok, Levoča, Banská Štiavnica, Prešov and Modra at which studied a large number of the members of the Slovak Lutheran intelligentsia.

Despite all of the conflicting tendencies in the development of education after the year 1790, the nucleus of the school system erected in the spirit of the Enlightenment was preserved. It did not lack, moreover, forward-thinking individuals who sought to strengthen it. The possibility to achieve this was improved by the creation of a commission for schools by the Diet, the "*deputation regnicolaris litteraria*", which prepared new editions of both school and curricular orders for Hungary. In the area of public schools attention was given to the improvement of technical education while in the area of higher education a plan was considered to make a distinction in specialized training and discussed the question of the differences between the universities and the academies. The new reforms suggested, however, were not realized because of internal political conditions.

The estates were satisfied with a formal return to the conditions which existed before the year 1780. The most significant gain was reflected especially in the language regulations of the Diet which made Hungarian the predominant language in all types of schools. Education more and more began to manifest the conservative characteristics of the policies of Francis I. There ceased to be interest in the education of the people as a whole because it could result in the social emancipation of the working classes. In the schools discipline was strengthened and religious education was once again given preference over practical education. The church again played an important role in the administration of the school. This was a clear step backward from the original intentions of the reforms which began with Maria Theresa. All of these adjustments were manifested in a new edition of the "*ratio educationis*" in 1806.

In principle, the concept of the state as the highest authority in the administration of education was not abandoned, a view that also allowed the non-Catholic schools to develop rather freely. In

this, the tendencies which had been introduced already at the beginning of the period of this study were fulfilled. The already existing framework of Lutheran and Catholic schools was completed as the conditions for their continued activity were established in law. This laid the foundation for the massive growth of literacy and of an educated populace. Even though the Slovak nation did not have anchored in law the right to develop its own national schools, and despite the threat to even the lowest level of schools by the spread of Magyarization, the schools that did exist in Slovakia provided an education for those individuals who would emerge as the Slovak intelligentsia and who created the movement known as "národné obrodenie," the national revival.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ Vladislav Ružička, *Školstvo na Slovensku v období neskorého feudalizmu* (Bratislava, 1974); Domokos Kosáry, *Művelődés a XVIII. századi Magyarországon* (Budapest, 1981). This work was also issued in 1987 in an English edition; Ján Čaplovič, *Bibliografia tlači vydaných na Slovensku do roku 1700*, Vols. I-II (Martin, 1972, 1984); Richard Rybář, *Dejiny hudobnej kultúry na Slovensku*, I (Bratislava, 1986); Anna Petrová-Pleskotová, *Maliarstvo 18. storočia na Slovensku* (Bratislava, 1983); Eduard Winter, *Frühauflärung* (Berlin, 1966), See especially the section on Slovakia, pp. 193-213; Ján Mišianik, *Pohľady do staršej slovenskej literatúry* (Bratislava, 1974); Jozef Minárik, *Baroková literatúra. Svetová, česká, slovenská* (Bratislava, 1984).
- ² A general overview is provided by Anton Špiesz, *Slobodné kráľovské mestá na Slovensku v rokoch 1680-1780* (Košice, 1983). Individual questions are treated by Anton Špiesz, "Der Wiener Hof und die Städte des Königreichs Ungarn in den Jahren 1681-1780" pages 83-95 and Štefan Kazimír, S. "Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Städte in der Slowakei im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert" pages 97-106 in *Die Städte Mitteleuropas im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, volume five in the series *Bieträge zur Geschichte der Städte Mitteleuropas* edited by Wilhelm Rausch (Linz, 1981); Marie Marečková, František Hejl and Rudolf Fišer, "Die Ostslowakischen Städte in der Struktur der mitteleuropäischen Handelsverbindungen im 17. Jahrhundert" pages 111-136 in *Problems of Continuity and Discontinuity in History* (Prague, 1980).
- ³ Ján Rezik, and Samuel Matthaieides, *Gymnaziológia. Dejiny gymnázií na Slovensku*. Edited by Vladislav Ružička (Bratislava, 1971).
- ⁴ Viliam Čičaj, *Knižná kultúra na strednom Slovensku v 16.-18. storočí* (Bratislava, 1985).
- ⁵ *Prešovské kolégium v slovenských dejinách*, edited by Imrich Sedlák (Košice, 1967).

- ⁶ For an analysis of his works see *Dejiny filozofického myslenia na Slovensku I* (Bratislava, 1987), pp. 104-125.
- ⁷ Concerning the works of Izák Caban, a representative of the philosophical doctrine of atomism, see *Dejiny filozofického myslenia na Slovensku I*, pp. 125-136.
- ⁸ A replay of the scene occurred in linguistic bi- and trilingualism, quite common in the cities of Slovakia, and especially in the frequency of the mastery of Latin. Among the 181 newly accepted citizens in Trenčín during the years 1762-1777 there were 74 individuals who knew Latin. The pupils of the lowest classes of the gymnasium normally made up about half of the total number of students. At the beginning of the eighteenth century there were, in the whole of Slovakia, fourteen Jesuit and six Piarist gymnasiums.
- ⁹ The Ursuline order opened its school in Bratislava in 1689 and schools in Trnava and Košice in 1687. The Order of Notre Dame de Namur came to Bratislava in 1747.
- ¹⁰ *Trnavská univerzita v slovenských dejinách*, edited by Viliam Čičaj and Vladimír Matula (Bratislava, 1987). See also *Pamiatke trnavskej univerzity, 1635-1777* (Trnava, 1935).
- ¹¹ Branislav Varsik, *Národnostný problém Trnavskej univerzity* (Bratislava: 1938).
- ¹² In a complicated political struggle and on the basis of a realistic assessment of the situation in Hungary Pázmány endeavored to secure for the University the protection of the strongest political force in the kingdom, the monarch. The struggle over Jesuit influence upon universities also occurred in Vienna and Prague. See Anton Vantuch, "Založenie trnavskej univerzity" in *Trnavská univerzita v slovenských dejinách*, pp. 47-48 and also his "Trnavská univerzita, súčasný stav bádania a úlohy ďalšieho výskumu" pp 69-80 in *Zborník Muzea školstva a pedagogiky na Slovensku* (Bratislava, 1986); Josef Haubelt, *České osvícenství* (Prague, 1986), p. 57.
- ¹³ Anton Vantuch, "Trnava ako univerzitné mesto," *Historický časopis* 21, (1973): 497-529.
- ¹⁴ The question of legal education as a whole was treated in *Die juristische Bildung in der Slowakei und Ungarn bis zum Jahre 1848*, *Acta facultatis juridicae Universitatis Comenianae* (Bratislava, 1968).
- ¹⁵ Mária Bokesová-Uherová, *Lekárska fakulta trnavskej univerzity, 1770-1777* (Bratislava, 1962).
- ¹⁶ *Typographia Universitatis Hungaricae Budaë, 1777-1848* (Budapest, 1983); Izidor Kotulič, "Význam trnavskej univerzity pre rozvoj kultúrnej slovenčiny," pages 69-95 in *Trnavská univerzita v slovenských dejinách*.
- ¹⁷ Concerning public education see Eva Kowalská, *Státne ľudové školstvo na Slovensku na prelome 18. a 19. storočia* (Bratislava, 1987).
- ¹⁸ The Enlightenment concept of the absolutist state was extensively developed in the works of Joseph von Sonnenfels. The first detailed monograph concern-

ing his life is Helmut Reinalter (Ed.), *Joseph von Sonnenfels* (Wien, 1988).

- ¹⁹ *Ratio educationis totiusque rei literariae per Regnum Hungariae et Provincias eidem annexas* (Vindobonae, 1777). A Slovak translation was issued by M. Novacká and Ján Mikleš (Bratislava, 1988).
- ²⁰ The curriculum was enlarged to include such subjects as moral education and the fundamental principles of agriculture. The attention given to practical subjects was evident in the public schools.
- ²¹ The text for geography was written by Matej Bel and was issued several times during the century. The Piarist order, which took into its hands some of the former Jesuit "gymnasiums" or grammar schools, had considerable experience in teaching practical subjects.
- ²² In 1777, in all of the 24 royal free cities in Slovakia, 3,964 pupils from these cities attended the 10 public and secondary Latin schools. In the same cities in 1780 there were 3,564 pupils in the exclusively Catholic public schools organized according to the "Ratio."
- ²³ A detailed study of Pietism in Slovakia is Ján Oberuč, *Mathieu Bel, un pietiste en Slovaquie en 18-ème siècle* (Strassburg, 1936). The newest collection of essays concerning the life and work of Matej Bel is *Matej Bel. Doba-Život-Dielo* (Bratislava, 1987).
- ²⁴ The road the students followed was directed most frequently towards the universities of Wittenberg and Jena and, from the start of the seventeenth century, especially towards Halle. Less or only incidentally visited were the universities at Göttingen, Königsberg, Leipzig, Thorn and so on. Benefactors of the schools established endowments for the benefit of the students which paid part of their study expenses. For more particulars concerning the travels of the students see V. Ružička, pp. 194-215. In 1766, the Lutheran gymnasium in Bratislava had 24,300 florins at its disposal to pay for the foreign study of its students. Special foundations were created for students in Tübingen, Wittenberg, Leipzig, Jena, Halle and Nuremberg. Archive of the capital city of Slovakia, Bratislava, 1766, Conc. 541.
- ²⁵ F. Kigler took part in the organization of an orphanage in Senec according to the model of the orphanage in Halle and, after the Edict of Toleration, he took part in the discussions between the Protestants and the state school administration on the subject of mixed schools.

The Kremlin and The Slovak National Uprising

August-October, 1944

MICHAEL KRAUS

Copyright © 1991, Michael Kraus

In contrast to the German Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, the quasi-independent Slovak state had become a brewing ground for anti-German resistance by the spring of 1944.¹ The main organization of the underground, the Slovak National Council (SNR), brought together a loose coalition of Communists, Socialists, and Liberal-Democratic opponents of the pro-German government headed by Monsignor Jozef Tiso. Encouraged by the advance of the Red Army, which by early April had reached the Carpathians, the prewar Czechoslovak-Soviet boundary, the SNR agreed on plans at the end of June, for an uprising involving the defection of sizeable units of the Slovak army to the Allies. According to these preparations, the insurrection would begin either if the Germans attempted to occupy Slovakia (as they had not yet done) or if the action could be coordinated with the advance of the Red Army. In the latter (and much preferable) case, the conspirators hoped that the collapse of the pro-German authority — in conjunction with the army's defection — would open Slovakia to a lightning strike of Soviet forces. Colonel Ján Golian, a high-ranking officer in the Slovak army, who enjoyed the backing of the Edvard Beneš government in London, was entrusted with the military leadership of the revolt.²

From the very outset, the insurrection plans were beset by problems. For one, the underground lacked the commitment of a sufficient number of military commanders to assure the success of

the revolt inside the Slovak army. Nor was there a full appreciation for the military-logistical obstacles that lay in the path of the Red Army, namely the Carpathian Mountains. Moreover, mutual distrust among the political actors planning the insurgency complicated the preparations. Even more importantly, the conspirators lacked any direct means of communication with Moscow. Slovak Communists were unable to establish a two-way radio communication with the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (KSČ), whose most senior members resided in the Soviet Union. As a result, in what was surely one of the more bizarre operations of the war, the insurgents attempted until August to coordinate the preparations for the uprising with the Soviet military via the Beneš government in London.

Beneš, on the other hand, though he maintained contact with Golian through a short wave transmitter, was not fully versed in the composition of the SNR, the political arm of the conspiracy. In addition to Beneš-loyalists, the SNR activists included the leaders of the Slovak Communist Party (KSS) Karol Šmidke and Gustáv Husák. Šmidke had been sent back to Slovakia by the Comintern in June 1943 in order to resurrect the battered ranks of the KSS. The trials and then triumphs of Husák's political career still lay ahead of him: Communist prisons in the 1950's, and the country's leadership in the 1970's and the 1980's. In mid-1944, these men hoped to exploit the revolt for purposes of their own.

Negotiations between Beneš and Moscow concerning military aid to Slovakia had been under way since the fall of 1943. Throughout these talks, the Soviets seemed receptive to Czechoslovak proposals and agreed to provide the necessary training and equipment for special Czechoslovak units that were to be deployed in the event of an anti-German insurrection in Slovakia. As early as November 1943 Colonel Heliodor Píka, the head of the Czechoslovak military mission in the Soviet Union and a Beneš loyalist, informed London that the Soviets had promised to provide equipment for 50,000 men and to airlift into Slovakia units of the Czechoslovak armed forces organized on Soviet soil. Moscow also agreed to supplement these forces with Soviet paratroopers.³

Negotiations about military assistance intensified especially after the official visit by Beneš to Moscow in December 1943 dur-

ing which the Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty of Friendship Mutual Assistance, and Postwar Cooperation was signed.⁴ Thus, when Slovak requests for military supplies reached London in early summer 1944, Beneš felt confident enough to reassure the rebels of "the certainty that at the given time, you shall get the weapons."⁵ To his surprise, however, enquiries in Moscow proposing the coordination of the revolt with Soviet actions on the war front met with evasive replies. NKVD General G.S. Zhukov, who supervised the foreign military units in the USSR, explained in late July that his government could not specify a date for a joint action in Slovakia. He advised Beneš, unhelpfully, that the Slovak insurrectionists should take into account the "strategic situation as it will develop at a given time." Similarly, Moscow temporized on an urgent request from the Czech leader to supply the already promised arms to the Slovak loyalists.⁶

But Moscow's picture of the Slovak situation improved considerably in early August when a small Slovak mission, seeking to coordinate the revolt with the Soviet advance, reached the Soviet Union. Though ostensibly the delegation came from the SNR, the plenipotentiaries represented, in fact, three different political groups: Slovak Communists, Beneš-loyalists, and the Slovak Ministry of Defense. Certainly the most intriguing offer came in the form of a memorandum from Slovakia's Minister of Defense, General Ferdinand Čatloš. He proposed to establish a military dictatorship in Slovakia, "cancel" the war against Russia and the Allies, declare war against Hungary, and in exchange for some degree of Slovak independence align Slovak internal politics "in accordance with Soviet interest."⁷ Strangely enough, Čatloš, who furnished the plane for the mission to Moscow, had been unaware of the SNR conspiracy from whose ranks the other emissaries came. Of special interest to Moscow were reports brought by Šmidke that informed the Soviet General Staff of the disposition and the equipment of the Slovak forces as well as of the plans of the SNR.

On a separate note, a memorandum prepared by Husák assessed the situation in terms highly favorable for the party's cause. "It is clear," he wrote, "that when the war ends, there will be only one party with a crushing Communist majority." Speaking on behalf of the KSS leadership, Husák claimed that if a free election

were held in the summer of 1944, at least seventy percent of the Slovaks would vote for the region's incorporation into the Soviet Union, while twenty percent at most would want Slovakia to reunite with the Czechs. "We want to be a part of the USSR," declared Husák. "Why seek salvation with Beneš, when Stalin has a proven recipe," asked the future leader of Czechoslovakia. If the country had to be reconstituted, submitted Husák, then as a "socialist federation of nations."⁸ Given that no evidence supports Husák's contentions concerning Slovak public opinion, his views shed more light on the attitudes of the KSS leadership than on anything else (when the Soviets searched for a successor to Dubček in 1968, the file from 1944 could hardly do any harm to Husák's candidacy). In fact, as late as December 1944, the underground leaders of the KSS evidently required tutoring by Georgi Dimitrov, the Comintern's ex-chief, then serving as the head of the International Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU, that "the detachment of the Slovaks from the Czechs is not at present in the interest" of Moscow. "We should restrain those people in Slovakia who want to rush things too much where Soviet power is concerned," Dimitrov advised. "Do not raise the question of Sovietization of Czechoslovakia now," he counselled.⁹

Šmidke was debriefed on August 5 by General Lev Mekhlis, the political commissar of the Fourth Ukrainian Front, and then met with other Soviet military and political representatives, including Dimitrov. Stalin received a report on the Šmidke mission on August 10. Šmidke's information gave the Soviet General Staff — to quote Sergei Shtemenko, the Chief of its Operation Department — "a complete picture of the situation in Slovakia."¹⁰ The Soviets seemed interested in the Čatloš offer, at least for a while. That would help to account for the fact that despite the urgent call from Slovakia for the coordination of military planning, the Soviets attempted to hide the Slovak mission from both the Beneš government and the KSČ Politburo. So it was not until August 27 that Šmidke reported to the Czechoslovak embassy, where he met with Beneš' representatives.¹¹

In any event, Beneš had been informed independently that a Čatloš representative had gone to Russia. Intimations of Soviet contacts with Čatloš alarmed the Czech leader. During his

December 1943 visit to the Soviet Union Beneš told Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov that Čatloš was among the traitors who "must hang." In that spirit, the President in August 1944 instructed the Czechoslovak Ambassador in Moscow, Zdeňek Fierlinger, to advise the Soviet government that direct or indirect negotiations with the "Slovak quisling rabble" can take place only through the offices of the Czechoslovak government. Any other conduct, warned Beneš, might violate Soviet-Czechoslovak agreements and would put the West on notice that "our Soviet policy has failed." In September, when the uprising was already under way, Moscow replied lamely that the talks with the Čatloš emissaries were conducted by the CPSU. "The Soviet government," read the reply, "had nothing to do with it." In the meantime, however, the Soviets gave no indication of their plans to the insurgents or to Beneš.¹²

But on a separate level, Soviet-led actions influenced the outbreak of the uprising in late August. Radio dispatches from Soviet or Soviet-led partisan groups operating in Slovakia since July highlighted the favorable conditions for partisan warfare. By early August the partisans established contacts with both the KSS and the SNR and radioed the headquarters in Kiev that "plans for action against the Germans are ready . . . the leaders of the Slovak army request a signal for a joint action . . ." ¹³ Nikita Khrushchev, under whose authority the Kiev partisan center functioned, passed the information on to Stalin in mid-August. Meanwhile, additional partisan groups and supplies were being airdropped and the partisan "fever" was rapidly catching on in Slovakia. There was the danger, however, that the rapid spread of sabotage activities would provoke the German occupation of Slovakia and thereby trigger the insurgency prematurely. Precisely for that reason, Husák intervened with the main partisan group on August 21, but his efforts came to naught, for the partisans respected only orders from the Kiev command.¹⁴ In the following week the partisan acts of sabotage finally brought on German military intervention and, in turn, a premature outbreak of the insurgency on August 29.

Though Soviet moves surrounding the Slovak revolt are something of a jigsaw puzzle, the following facts are beyond doubt. Moscow had known in advance, from both Beneš and the SNR,

of the preparations under way in Slovakia. In order of the revolt to begin under the most propitious circumstances, a coordination with Soviet military plans was essential. The Soviets, however, made no effort in this direction. The SNR mission, whose return within a week or so had been anxiously expected by the insurgents, spent five weeks in the Soviet Union, coming back only a week after the uprising began.¹⁵ Nor do the orders issued to the Red Army — poised North and East, twenty five to forty miles, from the borders — indicate that Stalin wished the revolt to succeed. On August 25, Colonel Heliodor Pika, the head of the Czechoslovak military mission in the Soviet Union and a Beneš loyalist, informed the Russian military command that Slovakia might be occupied in a matter of days by the Germans.¹⁶ On the following day, on August 26, Stalin rescinded the original plan for an offensive operation in the East which was to commence two days later, and ordered the 4th Ukrainian Front to go into a "defensive" mode.¹⁷ Its advance was not resumed until seven weeks later. North of the border, the First Ukrainian Front, to which Czechoslovak military units were attached, went into action only on September 8.

On that day the Soviets also replaced General Jan Kratochvíl, the Beneš-appointed commander of the Czechoslovak Corps in the Soviet Union, with Ludvík Svoboda, whom they and the KSČ Politburo had groomed for the post all along. But it took a full month and enormous casualties before the troops made their way through the mountain passes. And it took just as long for the Soviet-organized airdrop of a Czechoslovak paratrooper brigade, allegedly on account of poor weather conditions. The transfer of the paratrooper brigade did not begin until the night of September 25-26. And the same reason was given for the six-week long delay in the transfer of Beneš' representatives from Moscow to Slovakia.¹⁸

But inclement weather conditions did not prevent the more immediate Soviet dispatch to Slovakia of Šmidke, and of two KSČ Politburo members, Rudolf Slánský and Jan Šverma, nor can they account for Moscow's orders giving priority to Soviet-led partisans over the insurgents in the limited weapons aid supplied. Šmidke returned to Slovakia on September 4; the KSČ Politburo members, Šverma and Slánský, arrived on September 28, while the Beneš government representatives got there only on October 6-7.¹⁹ Finally,

the Soviets effectively frustrated Beneš' attempts to obtain Western assistance. In July and August the British told Beneš that, though military supplies were available, the airlift was contingent on Soviet permission because Slovakia belonged to the Soviet sphere of war operations. Before the uprising the Soviets assured Beneš that ample aid was forthcoming, but when urgent requests for weapons aid from Slovakia in September prompted Beneš to turn to the British again, Moscow ignored the Foreign Office enquiries regarding Soviet intentions.²⁰ The uprising collapsed on October 28, after two months of bitter fighting.

What, then, were the Kremlin's objectives? Stalin's aims in Slovakia have to be viewed in the broader context of Soviet priorities and military capabilities. As seen from Moscow in the summer of 1944, Slovakia represented only one operation in a war that stretched Soviet armies over a thousand mile front from the Baltic Sea to the Balkans. Several war developments overshadowed the military-political significance of the Slovak operation. In the two weeks between August 23 and September 8, Romania and Bulgaria switched sides in the war to join the Allies, and Finland capitulated. The rush of the events in the Balkans evidently led the Soviet command to contemplate a thrust into Hungary, bordering on southern Slovakia. John Erickson's exhaustive survey of Soviet war strategy characterizes the Romanian defection of August 23 as "one of the decisive days of the entire war."²¹ Though he implies that the Soviet General Staff orders to the 4th Ukrainian Front "not to embark on any offensive operations" were related to the Romanian-Hungarian operations, he does not explain how.²² Erickson concludes that the Soviet command, "to the degree that it was actually culpable, made Slovakia the victim of its inflexibility."²³ Hence, as cynical as Stalin's orders to the Fourth Ukrainian Front (to go on the "defensive") may appear at a first glance, they may have been related to the projected move into Hungary, a far more valuable prize militarily than Slovakia. At any rate, the costs of mounting a surprise attack through the treacherous passes of the Carpathian mountains must have seemed excessive to Stalin in relation to the small military gains and uncertain political rewards of the Slovak operation.

What the well-meaning Beneš could not know was that the

Soviet General Staff had been highly suspicious of any "military putsch" in Slovakia under the auspices of the London government. According to later revelations by Shtemenko, the Soviet command had also lacked the conviction that the revolt against the Germans would succeed on military grounds. There was yet another reason for the Soviet refusal to provide Beneš with a timetable: "It looked like an attempt to feel out the plans of the Soviet Supreme Command," notes Shtemenko.²⁴

Clearly Stalin was not keen on bolstering the Beneš-loyalists, whom Shtemenko even years later characterized as "bourgeois military putschists." Nor did the Soviet leader make a habit of supporting zealous Communist radicals of Husák's variety. Unwittingly, Klement Gottwald, the Moscow-based leader of the KSČ, might have sealed the fate of the uprising when in the first days of September he informed Molotov of the political character of the uprising's revolutionary Council and drew an analogy with Tito's Yugoslavia.²⁵ Over the previous year Stalin had had ample difficulties with Tito, whose political independence grew commensurately with the success of his resistance movement. All things considered, Stalin preferred to let the Red Army do the job of driving the Germans out of Slovakia, while the Soviet-led partisans continued to stir up trouble in the enemy's rear.

At the same time, Moscow could hardly afford to do nothing for the Slovaks. On the one hand the Russians had been promising military assistance to Beneš for months, and on those grounds discouraged Western aid to Slovakia. On the other hand, Stalin could no longer ignore the adverse Western reaction to the July-August failure of Soviet assistance to the Warsaw Uprising. The mixture of these motives was evident in the way Moscow handled the Slovak insurgency. While the Soviets went through the motions of assisting the Slovak rebels, they did not take decisive measures to tilt the balance in favor of the insurgents.

Different participants in the Slovak events were bound to draw different lessons from the experience. The uprising spelled the de facto end of the Tiso regime and, for the remainder of the year, Slovakia turned into a war zone. For a significant segment of the Slovak population the uprising marked a proud chapter in what was one of the largest European acts of resistance against Hitler.

Equally important, representatives of Slovak resistance secured for themselves a voice in the London-Moscow dialogue about the postwar order. As far as the KSČ leadership was concerned, the prominent role played by Slovak Communists in the insurgency created high expectations regarding the party's postwar influence in the region. In addition, the uprising provided some valuable experience with national committees, organized by party activists in many communities over the two month period. But the party leadership also sustained an important loss: Šverma, the second in command after Gottwald, and one of Dimitrov's adjutants, died in the Slovak mountains at the end of 1944.

By contrast, for Beneš and his supporters the lessons were all negative. To begin with, the uprising demonstrated the powerlessness of the London-based groups to shape the events in the distant heartland of the continent. Second, the abundant evidence of Soviet misbehavior cast a long shadow over the nature of the Soviet-Czechoslovak alliance. In addition to the incidents cited earlier, London discovered that Soviet partisans in Slovakia were far from bipartisan in political matters, clearly abetting the Communist cause. Third, Communist influence in the political headquarters of the uprising seemed to substantiate the party's claim to political leadership in the postwar period.

But equally telling blows to the Beneš circle came with the realization that Western military assistance to Czechoslovakia depended on Soviet good will. The inaction of the Americans and the British in August-October convinced Beneš that the Allies had agreed at Teheran on military and, by extension, on political spheres of influence, assigning Czechoslovakia to the Soviet sphere. In his *Memoirs* Beneš wrote of the Teheran Conference: "The division of the war zones in Germany and Central Europe was decided between the West and East at this time. Poland and Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary and Yugoslavia were placed in the Soviet zone. Nobody told us at the time either officially or unofficially. We only learned about it indirectly, much later, at the time of the Slovak uprising."²⁶ This conclusion — along with the loss of faith in Soviet commitments — significantly affected the perceptions of the representatives of democratic resistance concerning Czechoslovakia's place in the international order. As a result, the

London-based moderates after October 1944 were far more impressed by the weakness of their bargaining position — a weakness only accentuated by the weighty presence of the Red Army on Czechoslovak territory — vis-à-vis the Gottwald-led contingent of the KSČ. These factors and perceptions made themselves felt in the ensuing negotiations between the two factions of the political exiles concerning the postwar political system.

When the revolt was crushed at the end of October, Fierlinger reported to London the view of the Soviet General Staff that "the uprising fulfilled its political and military task by creating chaos in the German ranks and by depriving Germans of important communication centers."²⁷ And that is perhaps the best summary of Soviet objectives.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Preparation of this article for publication was facilitated by a grant from The Ada Howe Kent Foundation. It is based on my *The Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and the Second World War: The Foundations of Communist Rule*, Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1986.

² For the background on the Slovak rebellion see Anna Josko, "The Slovak Resistance Movement," in Victor Mamatey and Radomír Luža, eds., *A History of the Czechoslovak Republic 1918-1948* (Princeton 1973), pp. 362-383; Jozef Jablonický, *Z ilegality do povstania*, (Bratislava, 1969); other Jablonický contributions appearing in *samizdat*, *Bratislava a vznik Slovenského národného povstania*; *O vzniku SNR a vojenského ustredia*; and *Zlýhanie Malarovej armády v Karpatoch* (Prague, 1978-79); and *Zborník Slovenského národného povstania* (Toronto, 1975), esp. Miroslav Ličko, "K otázke spojeneckej pomoci v Slovenskom národnom povstaní."

³ *Dokumenty a materiály k dejinám československo-sovětských vztahů* (Prague, 1984), vol. IV, part 2, p. 24.

⁴ For evidence of Soviet support for Beneš's requests, see *ibid.*, 22-24, 34-35, 45-46.

⁵ Vilém Prečan, ed., *Slovenské národné povstanie-Dokumenty* (Bratislava, 1965) (hereafter *SNP*), p. 244.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 250

⁷ For the text of the Čatloš memorandum, see *SNP*, pp. 262-63; for an analysis, see Miroslav Ličko, "Čatlošov plan — politická naivita, alebo strategická iniciatíva" *Svědectví* (Paris), XV, (57,1978), pp. 69-84.

⁸ Husák's report, "O vyvoji a situácii na Slovensku," was published by Vilém Prečan for the first time in *Svědectví* (Paris), XV, (58, 1979), pp. 367-382.

- ⁹ For an incomplete record of these talks see Václav Král, *Osvobození Československa* (Prague, 1975), pp. 177-78; Miroslav Bouček, Miloslav Klimeš; Marta Vártíková, *Program Revoluce* (Prague, 1975), pp. 234-35.
- ¹⁰ S.M. Shtemenko, *Generalní štáb za války* (Prague, 1974), p. 297.
- ¹¹ For a report on the meeting prepared for Beneš see *SNP*, p.329 and ff; for a commentary by one of the participants, see Prokop Drtina, *Československo můj osud* (Toronto, 1982), Vol I, part II, pp. 631-642.
- ¹² For the briefing of Stalin see Andrei Grechko, *Cherez Karpaty*, (Moscow, 1970), p. 60; for speculations on why the Russians kept Šmidke from reaching both the KSČ Politburo and Píka see E. Friš, "Moskovský pobyt K. Šmidkeho v August 1944," *Příspěvky k dějinám KSČ*, vol. 4, (3, June 1964), pp. 439-444, and Vilém Prečan, *Svědectví*, XV, (58, 1979), pp. 365-366; for Beneš's comments see *SNP*, p.324.
- ¹³ *SNP*, p. 302
- ¹⁴ Khrushchev's cable to Stalin in *SNP*, pp. 294-5; for Husák's meeting with Soviet partisans see *Za národní osvobození, za novou republiku* (Prague, 1982), p. 32.
- ¹⁵ Gustáv Husák, *Svědectvo o Slovenskom národnom povstaní* (Bratislava, 1974), p. 212.
- ¹⁶ *SNP*, p. 329
- ¹⁷ Shtemenko, p. 298.
- ¹⁸ *SNP*, p. 562.
- ¹⁹ *SNP*, pp. 562-63; for evidence that weather conditions were not an issue see Drtina, *op. cit.*, pp. 661-62.
- ²⁰ For evidence that the British made their assistance plans contingent on Soviet approval, see *SNP*, p. 251. In early August Fierlinger cabled Beneš that Moscow was prepared to provide weapons aid to Slovakia "anytime"; see, *SNP*, p. 288. For a summary report by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Defense on the negotiations with the British and the Russians for military assistance see *Ibid.*, pp. 867-875.
- ²¹ John Erickson, *The Road to Berlin* (Boulder, 1983), p.360.
- ²² *Ibid.*, p. 293.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 307. But, because his account relies on discredited sources, Erickson's analysis of the political background of the Slovak uprising, including the Šmidke mission to Moscow, is sadly misinformed.
- ²⁴ Shtemenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 286-91, 295.
- ²⁵ Miloš Klimeš, et.al. . . ., *Cesta ke kvetnu: Vznik lidové demokracie v Československu*, vol. I, p. 203-206.
- ²⁶ *Pameti* (Prague, 1947), p. 375. And on the following page (p. 376), Beneš equates the military with the political shares of influence.
- ²⁷ *SNP*, p. 776.

An Act of Faith and Integrity:

Bishop Korec's Letter to Czechoslovak Television (Introduction)

STANISLAV J. KIRSCHBAUM

The following letter by a Slovak Catholic bishop to Czechoslovak Television objecting to the contents of the television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" is a document of great historical importance. Although it is quite different from other documents with explicit political goals, it shares with them a similar message and an appropriate sense of timing. It appeared at a time (April, 1989) when East European politics were once again undergoing change. But it is also, by virtue of content as well as timing, a declaration of Slovak national individuality. It reaffirms the vitality of the Slovak people and informs the world of their refusal to bow to internal as well as external oppression. Previous documents of similar historical importance carried a comparable message. Four are of particular interest.

In May 1848, as the Austrian Empire was being shaken by national and social revolutions, the leaders of the Slovak nation published a declaration which was sent to the Emperor in Vienna; it was their first political manifesto. In June 1861, when constitutional changes were being contemplated in Vienna, Slovak leaders published the Memorandum of the Slovak Nation, another document outlining their objectives. Each clearly stated the desire of the Slovaks to be recognized as a nation and to run their own affairs, goals that were not incompatible with the possibilities of the period. In October 1918, as the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary was disintegrating, Slovak leaders outlined in the Martin Declaration the political arrangement they wished to have with the Czechs

in a new state in order to ensure the further development of their people. Finally in March 1968, during the short-lived liberalization period in Communist Czechoslovakia, in a declaration published by the Slovak National Council, Slovak leaders clearly stated under what conditions their nation was willing to continue sharing a state with the Czechs in a Communist regime. In these, and other documents, there is one clear message: the aim of the Slovaks was to achieve national self-determination.¹

The fact that the Slovaks rarely reached all their stated objectives did not discourage them; it merely meant that they would have to try again. By doing so, their leaders were showing that they understood that for a small nation at the crossroads of Central Europe politics is the art of the possible.² As the bishop's letter states, this lesson is still valid and applicable today.

Bishop Ján Ch. Korec wrote to Bratislava Television at a time when many nations in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union were showing the political will to modify, if not change outright, the existing political system by, among other things, putting an end to political falsification. In the Soviet Union this is known as *glasnost*, a policy encouraged by the Kremlin not only for the Soviet peoples, but also for the peoples of Eastern Europe. It means telling the truth, not just about the deficiencies of the Communist system, but also about significant periods in a people's history. It is this latter theme that the letter addresses. It looks primarily at one of the most critical periods in Slovak history when, during a world war, the Slovaks were independent and governed themselves in the Slovak Republic. By refuting the falsifications around that period, the letter underlines the refusal of the Slovak people to have their national life determined by others. This is its implicit message.

Equally important in the letter is the absence of direct political demands, showing once again how well the Slovaks understand politics as the art of the possible. At the time when the letter was written and began to circulate in Slovakia, the Communist regime of Czechoslovakia was one of the most conservative and repressive in Eastern Europe. Bishop Korec was well aware of the fact that it served no purpose to go beyond a refutation of the falsehoods so blatantly stated in the television programme broadcast on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the declaration of Slovak In-

dependence. The fact that a Catholic bishop who strongly defends the political neutrality of the Church published this letter means that an overt political message was automatically excluded. But it would seem that the lesson of the 1960s was also remembered: the road to the federalization of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic had been paved with the refutation of earlier distortions around the activities and the political goals of those involved in the 1944 events about which more is said below.

The letter celebrates recent Slovak history in its refutation of the arguments and interpretations found in the television series. It does so because Bishop Korec and others around him know to what depths of ignorance about their history many Slovaks have sunk and to what distortions they have been exposed. In one of the more poignant passages, he writes: 'Rare are the small nations which today can maim and defame their own history and in this way destroy the national consciousness of future generations as we know how to do in Slovakia.' The letter is eloquent testimony to the intellectual and moral bankruptcy of the Communist regime.

The contents of the letter also raised questions about broadcasting and cultural policies in Communist Czechoslovakia. This is evident in the description of the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power." The reader who has not seen it is made fully aware of the malicious fabrications and fantasies found in the programme's contents, presentation and approach. Whatever were the programme's political motives, they could not possibly have been achieved, for it is clear that it attacked the intelligence of every viewer except perhaps the least discriminating and the most primitive. The response of the two students makes the point forcefully.

The effort to mislead the Slovak public with this television series was so blatant that it left one wondering about the control the Slovaks have over their own television. The same question must be asked about Slovak membership in the Institute for Scientific Atheism of the Slovak Academy of Sciences to whom authorship of the programme is attributed. If, as has been suggested in a Slovak-American newspaper,³ the majority of the programme's authors were non-Slovaks, then the publication of the letter takes on additional meaning.

In the letter, Bishop Korec comes to the defence of the Slovak nation by defending the Catholic Church, its clergy and the faithful. Two factors account for such an approach; first, the television series unabashedly held the Church responsible for all that its authors perceived to have been either wrong or evil in Slovakia during the period 1918-1945. Secondly, the Catholic clergy did in fact play a role in this period of Slovak history. But more important, as Bishop Korec writes, "Slovak history cannot be understood without Christianity and the Catholic Church". Thus, to defend the Church is to defend the nation.

Bishop Korec divides the period under consideration into three phases. The approach is quite simple. First, an outline of the series' interpretation is given and then a refutation is offered which for all intents and purposes also rejects the Communist regime's official version of Slovak history. The refutations are not exhaustive, nor are they meant to be. But they are to the point and they open the door to a further examination of events and their current interpretations by Marxist and Western historians. Bishop Korec's letter is, in fact, a direct challenge to most contemporary historical works. Our purpose is to highlight the interpretations in the letter which mark a major departure from conventional wisdom about Slovak history.

The first phase of the letter deals with the twenty years of the First Czechoslovak Republic (CSR). According to the series, both the clergy and the Slovak People's Party, in which some priests were active, were against the state and sought its breakup. In addition to being simply untrue, this kind of interpretation is also dangerous because it reflects the over-simplification of history. The emphasis that the letter puts on the complexity of events is not unimportant, nor is it meant simply to state the obvious. The fact is that much of what is written about the Slovaks — and not just in the First CSR — is unfortunately over-simplified in one way or another.

There are not many serious studies, especially in Western languages, of the history of the First CSR. Let us look at three of them. While their authors recognize that relations between the Czechs and Slovaks were not always harmonious, the explanations given only too often lack sophistication or insight. The American

Czech Josef Korběl, for example, reduces the differences between the two peoples to Slovak conservatism and Czech progressivism and to the clash of personalities in Slovak political life. As in the television series, to the Reverend Andrej Hlinka is attributed much of the responsibility for the difficult relations, because, according to Korběl, he was "fascinated by his own words . . . and a fanatic Catholic priest" who wanted to be named a bishop.⁴ Korběl adds:

Hlinka's suspicions and bitterness in this personal matter [of not being named a bishop] grew into a political hostility that engulfed both Czechs and Slovaks. In the eyes of Hlinka's followers, [Vavro] Šrobár and the Czechs were the very incarnation of evil: atheists, socialists, liberals, and anticlericalists, who would bring untold misfortunes upon the country if Slovakia were not guaranteed an autonomy that assured the preservation of her own culture.⁵

Korběl shows very little understanding of the Slovaks and their desire to ensure by themselves and for themselves their national development.

In the second work, written during the Second World War, the Scot Robert W. Seton-Watson, who was one of the first Western scholars to write about the First CSR, also takes a reductionist approach even though he seeks in great detail to understand and explain the complexities of its political life and especially the position and role of the Slovaks. He writes:

There was from the first a profound "incompatibility of temper" between the two kinsmen [Slovaks and Czechs], due to long centuries of Slovak isolation from Western currents, followed by two generations of assimilation and "Magyarone" outlook. . . . the personal element [also] played an important part; and Slovak questions were only too soon grouped round the rivalry of two men who had first entered the political arena in close accord, in their native town of Ružomberok — Father Andrew Hlinka, eloquent, passionate, a churchman of the twelfth rather than the twentieth century and Dr. Vavro Šrobár, a doctor of

progressive and even sceptical outlook, already identified with strongly Czechophil and centralist views.⁶

Seton-Watson, like Korbel, deplores the fact that the Slovaks refused to accept the Czech agenda for their common state and reduces the tensions between the two nations to this refusal. He dedicated his book to the Czech nation.

In the third volume, a collection of essays on the Czechoslovak Republic by Western scholars, the American Slovak Victor S. Mametey sees the history of the First CSR as one of a state which sought to achieve political and economic modernization but which also had problems because of a debate between Slovaks. He writes:

While the struggle between the political right and left was the basic feature of Czech politics, the fundamental issue of Slovak politics was centralism versus autonomy and its cultural concomitant, Czechoslovak unity versus Slovak distinctness ("one nation or two?").⁷

Mametej further suggests that there was no Czech-Slovak conflict, rather "one between two Slovak political factions, not between Czech and Slovak politicians, let alone the Czech and Slovak peoples as a whole". Yet a few lines earlier he writes: "sincerely believing that the centralists alone represented authentic Slovak opinion, the Czech politicians steadfastly backed them. They themselves, however, rarely interfered in the conflict".⁸ Interpreted properly, this last sentence clearly indicates the nature of the dilemma for the Slovaks. The Czechs in fact controlled the outcome of the debate, namely the national non-recognition of the Slovaks and their assimilation into the Czech nation, which is the reason why they did not need to interfere. To suggest that there was no conflict between Czech and Slovaks is therefore, not only absurd, but it is also to distort the essence of the history of the Czechoslovak Republic, namely the unsuccessful attempts to balance Czech-Slovak relations politically and constitutionally to the benefit of both nations. That, more than anything else, is what the history of the Czechoslovak state, whether democratic or communist, is all about. As this involves both nations, one cannot reduce the responsibility of finding solutions uniquely to the Slovaks as Mametej does.

As far as Slovak works are concerned, particularly in the post-war period which is dominated by Marxist scholarship, the situation is rather singular. There are many books but only one approach. The reason for this, in the words of the editor of a comprehensive Marxist study of Slovak history for the period 1918-1948, is that Marxist scholars

write about Slovak history thoroughly, they try to evaluate in their organic relation the principal components of the economic, social and cultural life of the people in all its breadth and complexity.⁹

Be that as it may, they also simplify, because they focus on other and sometimes quite marginal aspects of the history of the First CSR. They take a class struggle approach which makes them concentrate primarily on the failures or successes of the working class, which did not constitute a majority of the population, and some of its political representatives, in particular the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (CPCS). Their approach is also dictated by later successful developments, namely the seizure of power, with Soviet help, by the Communists at the end of the Second World War.

Examination by Marxist scholars of Czech-Slovak relations in the First CSR is, therefore, subsumed in the analysis of class relations in the state. They recognize that the Slovak People's Party was the most important political party in Slovakia;

This party, which had the interest of the Slovak bourgeoisie at heart and which was dissatisfied with its political power and economic position, also influenced larger groups of Slovak citizens with a policy of sharp opposition against the Czechoslovak government, with attacks against centralism and with a policy which put the Slovak question at the heart of its intense political endeavors, a question that by law interested not only the nationalist bourgeoisie, but also other classes and groups in society.¹⁰

But when it comes to evaluating the Slovak People's Party's activities, they simplify both its role and impact on Slovak society:

However, the People's Party's main aim was to solve the Slovak question conservatively, something which was harmful to the nation because it appealed to backward groups and deepened their social and religious prejudices.¹¹

Given their approach, and in particular the subsequent seizure of power in Czechoslovakia by the Communists, the conclusion by Marxist scholars that in the late 30's none of the political parties fought for the safety of the First CSR, except "the CPCS which organized and systematically led the battle for the defense of the Republic, for the national interests of the Czechs and Slovaks"¹² comes as no surprise.

Other studies, particularly by émigré Slovak scholars, and others, analyze and present Slovak politics in the First CSR.¹³ However, they do not seek to indicate how the Slovak question fits into the complexity of political life in the state. As a result, a history of the First CSR which takes fully and accurately into account the participation of the Slovaks remains yet to be written, whether in a Western or in the Slovak language.¹⁴

It must be pointed out that the history of the inter-war years is not central to Bishop Korec's presentation. Rather, he focuses on the struggle to achieve the autonomy of Slovakia, and his interpretation is one of the most accurate and balanced to be found thus far. It contrasts in particular with those authors referred to above who take a pro-Czech or "Czechoslovak" approach. He thereby also sets the tone for the analysis of the next, and rather critical phase, that of the Slovak Republic of 1939-1945.

In this phase, Bishop Korec looks at two important themes. The first concerns the Slovak Republic, in particular its creation and independence. According to Bishop Korec, the series "showed the creation of the Slovak State only through images of horror." Once again, it would seem that the presentation of these events was over-simplified.

If over-simplification is a problem that also concerns this period of Slovak history, there is a second one which is equally serious. It is the problem of approach; in most Western and Marxist studies, it is triumphalist. The fact that the Slovak Republic found itself on the losing side of the war determines the judgment and interpreta-

tion of its involvement in this period of European history. No allowance is made for the dilemmas Slovak politicians faced in their attempts to save the Slovak nation from harm, nor for the fact that they did not have unlimited ways and means at their disposal. As a result, what in other circumstances and for other nations would be acknowledged as acts of statesmanship are either misinterpreted, dismissed or ignored at best.

Bishop Korec's account of the events leading to independence shows a great deal of detachment and balance that even as thorough an account as that of Hoensch¹⁵ does not match. And in one sentence he indicates how a Slovak should look at those six eventful months (October 1938-March 1939) as Vnuk¹⁶ calls them: "Amazingly, the Slovaks kept their heads." The comparisons he suggests with more recent political upheavals and independence movements makes one wonder at the motives behind the numerous blanket condemnations of Slovak actions during this period that are found in many history books.

There is no thorough account of life in the Slovak Republic in the bishop's letter. On the other hand, he does raise the question of the degree of independence of the Slovak state. The attitude of the Church and its hierarchy is linked to this question. One cannot but be amazed that Bishop Korec has to explain what are simple facts of political life in any state, namely that the Church does not take a position for or against a state, but rather accepts to work within it, defending the faithful and taking care of their spiritual, and sometimes even their temporal needs. What he says about the degree of independence of the Slovak Republic in fact applies not only to the Church, but also to its citizens and today to historians: "One could not dismiss the Slovak State simply because it did not have the attributes of absolute independence." It is only in the matter of the diplomatic recognition of the Slovak Republic that there may be an error; it is generally accepted that 28 and not 30 states granted it *de jure* or *de facto* recognition.¹⁷

As can be expected, there is a strong defense of the Slovak Republic in the letter. Two reasons account for this; first the series itself. As Bishop Korec writes, it "showed life in the Slovak State to be directed by traitors to the nation, criminals who exploited and surrendered their country to the Germans and sent their peo-

ple to their death, all with the blessings of high officials and the Church". It is interesting to note that Edvard Beneš, as President of the Provisional Czechoslovak Government-in-exile in London, used similar images with regards to Slovak leaders in his broadcasts to Slovakia during the war.¹⁸ Secondly, there is the testimony of eyewitnesses who worked toward its destruction. This testimony as well as the description of its cultural output indicate that the Slovak Republic deserves to be examined in other than desultory or defamatory terms.¹⁹

Bishop Korec's letter also suggests new criteria that should be used to evaluate and judge properly the role of President Tiso.²⁰ He was a man who had, among many other tasks, the responsibility of keeping the Germans and their Slovak supporters from taking over and transforming the internal affairs of the state to the detriment of the nation. Bishop Korec indicates that Tiso did so with courage and adroitness in word and in deed, an evaluation that is backed with statements from contemporaries, including Communists.²¹ The same can be said with regards to the second theme in this phase, namely the Jewish question.

Anyone familiar with the Second World War must agree with the following passage in the letter: "It is not possible to find the appropriate words of horror and condemnation for the criminal murder of these people [the Slovak Jews deported to Poland] which later followed in the gas chambers." Bishop Korec is also one of the 24 signatories of a document of contrition in this matter which reflects the feelings of a great many people in the Slovak nation.²² At the same time, as the letter indicates, the involvement of Slovak authorities in this tragedy is not one of clear-cut collaboration, rather one of courageous resistance, at least until the events of September 1944.

There is a great body of literature on the tragedy of European Jewry, particularly from Jewish scholars.²³ In the Slovak case, they stress primarily, if not uniquely, the theme of collaboration. This can perhaps be best illustrated with a quotation from each of the two Jewish authors referred to in the letter, Hanna Arendt and Walter Laqueur.

According to Arendt, "Slovakia, like Croatia, was an invention of the German Foreign Office."²⁴ In the passages that follow

where she describes the Slovak handling of the Jewish question, she stresses the differences with the German way, yet still leaves the impression that, even with these differences of approach and deed, the Slovaks did not do anything else but collaborate in the tragedy that befell Europe's Jews. Laqueur, for his part writes: "Slovakia had been the first satellite to participate in the 'final solution.'" ²⁵ Yet in the pages that precede, even with all the evidence he has at his disposal or to which he refers, he does not indicate or explain the halt to the deportations or the use of Presidential exemptions by Tiso. There are others who share this approach ²⁶ and those who seek to explain the halt to the deportations attribute them to internal and external factors but not to Tiso. ²⁷

The tragedy that befell the Jewish people during the Second World War accounts to a great extent for the unrelenting single-minded approach of Jewish scholars with regards to this human tragedy. But as Milan S. Ďurica indicates, the evidence leads to other conclusions. ²⁸ This is what Bishop Korec also tells us in his letter. The Slovaks, like other peoples in the Western world, proposed policies, passed laws and participated in activities that discriminated against Jews; during the war, German anti-Jewish policies resulted in the extermination of millions of European Jews. It is to the discredit of the Slovaks that they allowed themselves to be involved in this tragedy by unlawful deportations; yet at the same time, their President, using the powers the Slovak Constitution gave him, and other officials, just like many individual Slovaks, ²⁹ were actively engaged in saving tens of thousands of Jews, and, until September 1944, in making Slovakia a haven for them and their co-religionists from other parts of Central Europe. Tiso and the Slovak Republic are entitled at least to have this mentioned.

It is not surprising that the television series did not give the Slovak Republic any recognition; paradoxically, it did not do so also for the third phase, the one which Marxist scholars call the Slovak National Uprising. Bishop Korec also refers to the events of September 1944 in the same way, but then, one could not expect anything else given the circumstances. What were the events of September 1944? Were they an "incredible conspiracy" as Vnuk labels them, ³⁰ or were they a Slovak National Uprising as Com-

munist historiography has canonized them? It is certainly one of the episodes in Slovak history most researched by Marxist historians.³¹ It also makes up one of the main elements of the official ideology of the Communist regime in federal Czechoslovakia and its anniversary is celebrated annually. This explains why Bishop Korec is careful in handling it.

It seems that the television series allowed itself much license in interpreting this event in Slovak history. Referring to trials connected with it shown in the series, Bishop Korec writes that

The unspoken claim which came out of all this [the trials] is that "priests" were primarily responsible for nearly all of the murders during the period September-November 1944, that they were responsible for all the destruction and suffering because "they were bringing up murders."

Bishop Korec rejects this interpretation but he does not defend the uprising as do Slovak Marxist historians. In one sentence he explains what it was all about: "The horrible logic of war applied to the uprising." He marshals a great deal of evidence to illustrate his point. He also comes to the defense of the Church and of President Tiso in their handling of the tragic events of September, 1944. These events still await their proper evaluation by historians. Once again, Bishop Korec hints at the criteria which should be used. It will not be an easy task.

Bishop Korec refers often to a number of items in his letter that pertain to the Church. It is interesting to note his reference to current Soviet history and to Soviet publications which now admit the harm of religious persecution. He defends the Church not only because the attacks in the series were unfounded, but especially because he wishes to underline the suffering believers have endured under Communism. Their numbers, furthermore, are not insignificant, as he points out. Certain religious events in Slovakia that preceded the broadcast of the series showed that the Catholic faith was by no means losing ground, especially among the youth.

Bishop Korec ends his letter not only by affirming his own faith, but also by emphasizing that the Church stands for something greater than everything and anything represented by the regime:

The Church towers like a peak into eternity. She embraces nations and continents and her breath blows through all generations. The measure of her faithfulness is not human faithfulness . . . she forgives even enemies, she is willing to serve them and to heal wounds. The Church is the way of all of our ways and along these roads, people have been walking to God for thousands of years.

Bishop Korec's letter to Czechoslovak Television testifies to his faith in God and in the Slovak nation which gave him the courage to write it.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ The main historical documents can be found in German translation in Jörg K. Hoensch, *Dokumente zur Autonomiepolitik der Slowakischen Volkspartei Hlinkas*, München, R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1984, pp. 71-276. Some of these documents are published in English translation in Joseph M. Kirschbaum, *Slovakia. Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe*, New York, Robert Speller & Sons, 1960, pp. 231-237.
- ² For more on the theme of the art of the possible in Slovak politics and history see Stanislav J. Kirschbaum, "East European Politics and the Art of the Possible. The Case of the Slovaks" in Manuel J. Pelaez, ed., *Papers on Regimes and Political Systems in Eastern Europe*, in press.
- ³ See Joseph C. Krajsa, "Truth at my Table. The Cross in Shackles", *Jednota*, 25 October, 1989.
- ⁴ Josef Korbel, *Twentieth-Century Czechoslovakia. The Meanings of Its History*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1977, p. 100.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 104.
- ⁶ R.W. Seton-Watson, *A History of the Czechs and Slovaks*, Hamden, CT, Archon Books, 1965 (originally published in London by Hutchinson & Co. Ltd., 1943), p. 333.
- ⁷ Victor S. Mamatey, "The Development of Czechoslovak Democracy, 1920-1938" in Victor S. Mamatey and Radomír Luža, eds., *A History of the Czechoslovak Republic 1918-1948*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1973, p. 120.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 126.
- ⁹ Miroslav Kropilák, "Úvod" in M. Kropilák et al, *Dejiny Slovenska V (1918-1945)*, Bratislava, Veda, Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej Akadémie Vied, 1985, p. 12.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 92.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 250.

- ¹³ See for example Joseph A. Mikuš, *Slovakia. A Political History 1918-1950*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1963; Joseph M. Kirschbaum, *Slovakia. Nation at the Crossroads of Central Europe*, New York, Robert Speller & Sons Publishers, 1960; Kurt Glaser, *Czecho-Slovakia. A Critical History*, Caldwell, Idaho, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1961; and František Vnuk, "Slovakia in Pre-Munich Czecho-Slovakia" in Joseph M. Kirschbaum, ed., *Slovakia in the 19th & 20th Centuries*, 2nd edition, Toronto, Slovak World Congress, 1973, pp. 101-127.
- ¹⁴ There is a recent study that looks at Czecho-Slovak relations since the creation of the Czecho-Slovak Republic from the point of view of minority management. See Carol Skalník Leff, *National Conflict in Czechoslovakia. The Making and Remaking of a State, 1918-1987*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1988.
- ¹⁵ Jörg K. Hoensch, *Die Slowakei und Hitlers Ostpolitik*, Köln-Wien, Böhlau Verlag, 1965.
- ¹⁶ František Vnuk, "Slovakia's Six Eventful Months (October 1938-March 1939)", *Slovak Studies*, IV, 1964, pp. 7-164.
- ¹⁷ On the question of the diplomatic recognition of the Slovak Republic, see Milan S. Ďurica, "The Foreign Policy of the Slovak Republic" in Stanislav J. Kirschbaum, *Slovak Politics. Essays on Slovak History in Honour of Joseph M. Kirschbaum*, Cleveland, Slovak Institute, 1983, p. 273 and especially p. 283, note 114. The dilemmas concerning the diplomatic status of the Slovak Republic are examined by Stanislav J. Kirschbaum, "The Slovak Republic, Britain, France and the Principle of Self-determination", *Slovak Studies*, XXIII, 1983, pp. 149-170. The best study of the relations between Slovakia and another state is by Štefan Parák, *Die Schweiz und der Slowakische Staat 1939-1945*, Bern, Peter Lang, 1987. The diplomatic relations between Slovakia and the Third Reich are examined by Milan S. Ďurica, *La Slovacchia e le sue relazioni politiche con la Germania 1938-1945*, Vol. I, Padova, Marsilio Ed., 1964.
- ¹⁸ See Stanislav J. Kirschbaum, "The Revolt of 1944" in Kirschbaum, *Slovak Politics*, pp. 292-294.
- ¹⁹ To this day, there is no exhaustive history of life in the Slovak Republic. Essays were published shortly after the war by people who had lived and worked in that state; see M. Šprinc, ed., *Slovenská Republika*, Scranton, PA, Jednota, 1949. There are however some overviews; see Milan S. Ďurica, "The Republic of Slovakia," *Slovak Studies*, I, 1961, pp. 105-121; by the same author, "Slovensko za druhej svetovej vojny — Slovenská republika" in Jozef M. Rydlo, ed., *Slovensko v retrospektíve dejín*, Lausanne, Liber, 1976, pp. 123-153; and Stanislav J. Kirschbaum, "The Slovak Republic and the Slovaks," *Slovakia*, XXIX (53-54), 1980-1981, pp. 11-38. Political life in the Slovak Republic is examined by the same author in "The Slovak Republic 1939-1945" in Stanislav J. Kirschbaum and Anne C. Roman, eds., *Reflections in Slovak History*, Toronto, Slovak World Congress, 1987, pp. 89-109; other interpretations are offered by Yeshayahu Jelinek, *The Parish Republic*, Boulder, East European Monographs, 1976, and

- by Jörg K. Hoensch, "The Slovak Republic, 1939-1945" in Mamatey and Luža, pp. 271-295.
- ²⁰ Tiso's philosophy and political programme are outlined in Lisa Guarda Nardini, *Tiso: Una terza proposta*, Padova, Ceseo-Liviana editrice, 1977, and by the same author, "The Political Programme of President Tiso" in Kirschbaum, *Slovak Politics*, pp. 221-250.
- ²¹ Communist historians offer, however, a different and opposite evaluation; see Jozef Klimko, *Tretia Ríša a ľudský režim na Slovensku*, Bratislava, Obzor, 1986.
- ²² "Vyhlásenie k deportáciám židov zo Slovenska", *Horizont*, XVI (6), 1987, p. 2. For an English translation of this declaration, see "Deportation of Jews From Slovakia. Declaration," *Cross Currents*, 9, 1990, pp. 269-270. The publication of this declaration also found a very favourable echo among Slovaks in exile. See "Solidarizuju sa," *Horizont*, VXII (1), 1988, p. 2.
- ²³ Until now, the most exhaustive study is by Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Revised and Definitive Edition, 3 Vols., New York, Holmes and Meyer, 1985. For an assessment of earlier studies on the tragedy of the Slovak Jews by an Israeli historian, see Yeshayahu Jelinek, "The Holocaust of Slovakian Jewry," *East Central Europe*, X (1-2), 1983, pp. 14-23.
- ²⁴ Hanna Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil*, New York, The Viking Press, 1963, p. 184.
- ²⁵ Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret. Suppression of the Truth about Hitler's "Final Solution"*, Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1980, p. 146.
- ²⁶ See for example, Yeshayahu Jelinek, "The 'Final Solution': The Slovak Version," *East European Quarterly*, IX (4), 1970, pp. 431-444. Jelinek modifies his approach somewhat later. See note 27.
- ²⁷ Livia Rothkirchen, "The Slovak Enigma: A Reassessment of the Halt to the Deportations," *East Central Europe*, X (1-2), 1983, pp. 3-13; and Yeshayahu Jelinek, "Slovaks, Germans, the 'Satellites,' and Jews," *Cross Currents*, 9, 1990, pp. 261-268. For his part, Michael R. Marrus, who also mentions the halt to the deportations, wonders: "Did these moves reflect serious second thoughts? Among some, including possibly Tiso himself, this may have been the case;" see Michael R. Marrus, *The Holocaust in History*, Toronto, Lester & Orpen Denys Limited, 1987, p. 79.
- ²⁸ Milan S. Ďurica, "Dr. Joseph Tiso and the Jewish Problem in Slovakia," *Slovakia*, VII (3-4), 1957, pp. 1-22. See also his *The Slovak Involvement in the Tragedy of the European Jews*, Abano Terme, Piovan Editore, 1989.
- ²⁹ See Kurt Neumann, "The Slovak Republic: A Lived Experience" in Kirschbaum and Roman, pp. 110-124.
- ³⁰ František Vnuk, *Neuveriteľné sprisahanie*, Middletown, PA, Literárny almanach Slovák v Amerike, 1964.

- ³¹ There is, on the other hand, only one monograph in a Western language on the 1944 events; see Wolfgang Vehnor, *Aufstand für die Tschechoslowakei. Der slowakische Freiheitskampf von 1944*, Hamburg, Christian Wegner Verlag, 1969. See also Stanislav J. Kirschbaum, "The Revolt of 1944" in Kirschbaum, *Slovak Politics*, pp. 286-313; and Anna Josko, "The Slovak Resistance Movement" in Mamatey and Luža, pp. 362-384.

*Letter from Bishop J. Ch. Korec To Czechoslovak Television
Concerning the Programme*

“The Cross in the Snares of Power”

J. CH. KOREC

The directors,
Československá televízia,
Mlynská dolina,
Asmolovova 28
841 04 Bratislava

From March 6 to March 13, 1989, Bratislava television broadcast the five-part series “The Cross in the Snares of Power” which ended on March 14 with the discussion entitled “Clericalism and Clero-Fascism in Slovakia”. The series was shown on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Slovak State. In the words of the narrators of the programme, it was meant mainly for the younger generation so that it might be informed about the events which took place half a century ago and whose consequences, it is claimed, are still to be felt today between the faithful and the Church in Slovakia in the so-called lay apostolate and in illegal ecclesiastical structures. The names mentioned in the introduction were those of O. Dányi, J. Čelko, V. Hudecková, O. Vyhlídal, V. Nedbal and others.

The series “The Cross in the Snares of Power,” by its very title, already indicated what it was all about — not the personality of politicians, nor the history of a political party, rather about the Catholic Church, the bishops, the priests and the faithful in Slovakia, in fact about the entire Church with the Pope at its head. The contents corresponded to the intention — to put everything in such a light that the outcome would be ridicule, irony and sarcasm. As a result, one found in this “series”, which was a collage

of photographs, parts cut from old films, journals and newspapers, accompanied by a one-sided and aggressive political commentary read on occasion in a theatrical pathetic tone, just about everything associated with the Catholic Church — Popes Pius XI and XII, the encyclicals, Bishops Jantusch, Kmet'ko, Vojtaššák, Čársky, Gojdič, Nécsey, Škrábik and Lazík, Slovak churches from the outside and the inside, pilgrimages, first communions and masses. All these elements were invariably accompanied by the appropriate political commentary which ridiculed them. Pictures from Slovakia, interspersed with mass graves, shootings, human bones, horses with a ploughman not far from a field cross going as far as to include the ridiculing of confession and the repeated shooting of people which ended with a theatrical and blasphemous "This is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world" alternated with pictures of [Adolf] Hitler from 1930, or before. A seventeen year-old high school student's comment on all of this was: "Satanic Verses the Slovak way." And a student who stood beside her added: "If there were a hundred Muslims in Slovakia, the authors of the series would probably have to hide in the mountains for the rest of their lives." Truly, according to the series, Slovakia and especially Catholicism, were the source of all things evil and only evil. Neither in the state, nor in the Church was there anything human; all gatherings, from confirmation through religious exercises to the meetings of bishops in Prague, were in the service of the bourgeoisie or especially Hitler. According to the series, this was applicable to the First CSR, and later, particularly to Slovakia. One had the feeling at times that when Slovak boys rang the bells in the belfry, the Japanese immediately attacked Manchuria. And when A. Hlinka spoke in the Prague Parliament, [Benito] Mussolini immediately proceeded to attack Abyssinia.

No historian was involved in the preparation of the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power." Although it concerned explicitly a historical theme, it was prepared by members of the Institute for Scientific Atheism of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. *Pravda* also published on 15 March 1939 an article from a member of the Institute of Historical Sciences entitled "The Tragic Consequences of the Munich Diktat," once more on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Slovak State. This article was in-

deed written without passion, in a sober and comparatively more factual and responsible way.

In the journal *Ogonok*, issue 50, December 1988, the editor and writer, A. Nezhny, in an interview with K.M. Kharchev, director of the Office for Church Affairs in the USSR Council of Ministers, criticized the abstract manner in which people wrote about religion and the Church in 1933. In the book *Under the Mask of Religion*, one reads that all metropolitans, bishops, priests, monks and church elders . . . "deceive the faithful and carry out their terrible fascist plots." In the same interview, K.M. Kharchev indicated that "for about 70 years, year after year, one heard repeated like a tape recorder that the Church was the carrier of an ideology inimical to our society, that it was important to see in priests a foreign element and that the faithful were people of "the third degree" . . . An unchangeable stereotype was created in the consciousness of the majority of party and state workers." In addition — in the same issue of *Ogonok*, the editor and writer A. Nezhny, pilloried severely the newest antireligious book, whose author "from the outset is not ashamed to bend the facts so that they fit into his scheme of things."

These last words pertain directly to the Bratislava series "The Cross in the Snares of Power." It presented pictures taken out of context, quotations, and film cuts, pasted together according to its defined aim, without regard for the historical circumstances of the time, and without any evaluation of historical conditions and possibilities; it was put together almost as if the specialists of dialectics had completely forgotten that there is unity and clash in contradictions, that an individual is not omnipotent in history, and that in Europe from 1938 on, Hitler's activities created dangerous conditions in which even the Great Powers did not know what to do. The authors have forgotten that as long as a small nation and state is caught in the middle of giants, politics is the art of the *possible*. They disregarded all human activities possible in very many, openly catastrophic situations, and did not deviate from their goal right to the end in accordance with the theme of "clericalism and clero-fascism"; in fact they pursued their goal mercilessly and without scruples even though this clericalism gave them, their fathers and three million Slovaks work and relative peace for six

years through the worst war in history and saved the lives of many.

The television series of March 1989 represents another myth born in Slovakia in the minds of biased and fanatic individuals. It is not the only one. A contemporary writer and historian recently said in an interview for a journal: "I am 50 years old and in that time I heard about Štefánik . . . in at least five different versions and each was false and not historical. You can really blame our historiography for quite a few things . . . It renounced living persons and replaced them with schemes and generalities. It is terrible to read about the red threads of development, how they go through history" (*Literárny týždenník*, 10/88).

Fortunately, the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" was not prepared by qualified specialists — historians. It would seem however that schemes and the red threads of development had already penetrated the blood of many Slovak intellectuals. Rare are the small nations which today can maim and defame their own history and in this way destroy the national consciousness of future generations as we know how to do in Slovakia. The average educated person is unable to speak intelligently and with pride about Sts. Cyril and Methodius, these scientists of the first rank who stood at the very beginning of our national history, language and culture. He is unable to be proud of the fact that of all the places where they worked in the Empire of Great Moravia our old Nitra, Devín and Zobor are definitely mentioned in old sources. He cannot be proud of the University of Trnava which for 150 years opened the world to us. The average Slovak began to speak Magyar in Hungary and in the First Republic he denied the Slovak in him and accepted the thesis of the single [Czechoslovak] nation. He forgot Bernolák, Holly and Štúr and refuses to accept Moyses and Štefánik. And he forgot that in this way, he hurts not only his nation the most, but also the Republic. Today, his colleagues laugh at those who — even with their many human faults and weaknesses — brought the nation to life in Hungary and in the First CSR, defended its rights and freedoms, language and individuality, whether they were Škultéty, Hlinka, Rázus or others. As a result, there remains very little from our history from which we could give our younger generations a feeling of Slovak national pride. Thus,

for many, our position in the Republic is also without interest and pride and we lack interest in the Republic.

Slovak history cannot be understood without Christianity and the Catholic Church. If this cannot be avoided, then the tendency is to blacken all. Everything that is Christian, and especially Catholic, is suspicious, ridiculous and ironic. When we nevertheless wish to speak about this in positive terms, we look around as if we were stealing.

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" reached new heights in ridiculing our history. The authors were not satisfied with criticizing individual politicians or political parties — they ridiculed religion, Christian images, symbols, mysteries [of the faith] and the Church, from mass, first communion through pilgrimages of the faithful, priests, bishops, right up to the popes.

A year ago, Bratislava television was convincing us in the programme "Current themes" that the faithful have exactly as many rights in our country as do non-believers. After the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power," the faithful were asking "Where can we respond to this intensive 6-part caricature of the Church in Slovakia and in the world?" Nowhere. It is not possible publicly to answer public insults — either in the press, on the radio or on television.

If I have decided to write you this letter, I have done so only very reluctantly. It concerns historical events which are still considered political even though they are half a century behind us. I took this decision out of a sense of responsibility dictated by my conscience because it concerns the faithful who make up more than half of the nation in Slovakia just as it concerns an important part of the faithful inhabiting the Czech Lands and Moravia who were also very offended. It concerns non-Catholics and non-believers as well who from a Christian or human point of view could hardly have been impressed by the stifling blasphemies of the series and its destructive influence within the nation, the state and the world. Having decided to write, I regret that I am not a Slovak historian, a writer or a poet who could have such an impact in this national affair that it would awaken the conscience of each Slovak and encourage him to seek the paths of understanding and unity in matters that are fundamental for the nation and the state, to accept

variety in others matters, and to seek ways of cooperation with all, showing respect for his own history, respect for other faiths and respect for the future of the nation and the state.

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" not only did not take such an approach, but rejected that aim without compassion. This was clear in the preparation of each theme — the First CSR, autonomy, the question of the Slovak State, and in the end in the discussion by the authors of all that is evil: the series included the popes, the bishops, the priests, the entire Church with her encyclicals, churches, masses, processions, crosses. I was particularly struck by one approach: the events of 50 years ago were not as simple as the authors of the series made them to be. They were much more *complex*. I would like to point to the complexity of the situation and the events. These are events that belong to history. Indeed, I will refer to them as *historical* facts. I will not evaluate them, but I will use documents from the period. The development of a comprehensive and critical evaluation that is factual and objective is also expected. We hope that historians will be able to do this without bias.

The journal *Výber* (13/89) introduced the written version of the text of the series as follows: "Majestic tones resound. The vault of a magnificent cathedral emerges filled with a sublime "Te Deum." Black boots glitter. Black uniforms. Looking at the picture, a commentator says: "They marched . . . they marched on 6 October 1938 and 14 March 1936 (?) to work together in the break up of the Czechoslovak Republic. In this series, we will march along the path of facts. They marched to the deportations, to the burning of partizan villages, communities and settlements in the winter of 1944-1945 . . . They suppressed basic human rights . . . The Catholic Action of Pius XI came to the aid of the Populists. In the elections of 1925, they emerged stronger, they doubled the number of deputies in Parliament . . . They gave up opposition and entered the government of the gentlemen's coalition . . ."

Already the text of these first sentences is confused. The aim of the Populists was to break up the Republic. Yet they entered the government. They were against the Republic, yet they achieved that "which Hlinka had once desired . . . to be a state-building party" according to a quotation in the article. In order to demean

the Populists, the authors of the series write and say that they entered a "gentlemen's coalition." The Populists were against the people, yet the people strengthened their position in the elections.

In the first part of the series, a great deal is said about Andrej Hlinka — from the year 1918 to his death in 1938. According to the series, Hlinka was arrogant, he was against the CSR and he played cards with his enemies. He was almost an enemy of the Slovak nation; in a word, he was a "clerical." This expression was once used for practical reasons to denote political movements in which there were also priests or which were guided by Christian principles — much in the same way as one spoke in a shortened fashion of "Agrarians," "Nationalists," "Socialists." Today one adds to this expression an exclusively defamatory meaning — "clericalism and clero-fascism."

What was Andrej Hlinka really like? One finds in *Slovenský Biografický Slovník* that Andrej Hlinka (born on 27 September 1864) had become active in Slovak affairs in the year 1895 with the aim of "setting the people free from social oppression . . . and winning them for the national movement." He wrote in *Národné noviny*, founded *Ľudové noviny*, founded farmers' organizations, food cooperatives, temperance leagues and reading groups. In 1906 he was condemned to two years imprisonment in Segedin for his activities. "In the summer of 1917, he accepted the idea of a common state of the Czechs and Slovaks, which he confirmed again in October 1918 as a member of the Slovak national Council and a signatory of the Martin Declaration of the Slovak Nation and he even asked his clerical movement to support the new state" (Vol. II, p. 338).

A contemporary Slovak historian writes: "Hlinka together with [Vavro] Šrobár was one of the most capable personalities fighting for Czechoslovak statehood" (*Literárny týždenník*, 2/88).

The television series is pathetically ironic about the agreement between the "spiritual leader" of the state and the Church in the way it manifested itself already in 1919 in Žilina. The series also mentioned ecclesiastical properties. Of course, there was no mention of the fact that these properties were acquired gradually from donations from believers or rulers for direct services, that the Church since time immemorial built on these properties schools,

orphanages, teacher's colleges, universities and hospitals of which the state as such took no care. The Church maintained everything on these properties in the same way as the Ministry of Finance does today from the taxes of the workers. When these properties were taken from the Church in Slovakia, one of the people who was close to Bishop [Ján] Vojtaššák was asked what the bishop would do now, he replied: "Until now he ate švábka with kiška, from now on he will eat kiška with švábka."

On a number of occasions the television series judged the activities of the People's Party as inimical to the First Republic because of its demand for autonomy. This is an over-simplification. Hlinka and his party based themselves on the Pittsburgh Agreement which was signed on 31 May 1918 by the representatives of the Slovak League [of America], the Czech National Council, the Association of Czech Catholics, and the President of the Czechoslovak National Council, Professor [Tomáš G.] Masaryk. One reads in the Agreement: "Slovakia will have its own administration, its own parliament and courts." In the so-called Cleveland Agreement of 22-23 October 1915, there was reference to "a federal union of states with full national autonomy for Slovakia, with her own parliament and her own state administration." It was on this basis that the Hlinka Slovak People's Party [HSPP] developed the defence of Slovak needs and national demands. When people in the CSR began officially to speak of a single Czechoslovak nation and when the demand for autonomy was refused, there were harsh political debates in Parliament and in the daily press. Certainly, it is not true that the "clericals" wanted to break up the republic. They wanted a republic that gave autonomy to Slovakia.

At certain times, the People's Party was not alone in this struggle. The leader of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCS], B. Šmeral said in Parliament on 18 December 1925 after the general election: "Each nation has the right to determine freely its own destiny up to separation through its representative committees elected by the working masses. We will support even the demand for autonomy . . ."

The reception that the people gave to Hlinka's policies was shown in election results. In the election of 1925, the People's Party received 34.31% of the vote, the Social Democrat 4.25%, the

Agrarians 20.29%, the CPCS 13.27% and the National Party 2.49%.

The claim repeated in the series that "priest and the hierarchy" were against the Republic is not based on historical reality. In his testimony before the National Tribunal on 6 January 1947, Archbishop [Karol] Kmet'ko was asked the following question: "How did you explain [Jozef] Tiso's moderation after the elections of 1925?" Dr. Kmet'ko replied: 'We were all pleased especially because now even the Czechoslovak government recognized the People's Party as one which they had to invite into the government.'

If later the People's Party left the government and returned to the opposition benches, it was not a result of enmity towards the Republic. It was the continuation of the struggle for the recognition of the individuality of the Slovak nation and for the attainment of autonomy. In the democratic atmosphere of the time, the speeches and articles of politicians were certainly often aggressive, harsh and combative. But such was the free atmosphere of the period. Other politicians also wrote in equal, even harsher, tones. In the 1926 November issue of *Proletarká*, the author of an article asked: "What does the proletariat have in common with October 28? Does it even have some enthusiasm for it? Certainly not! Only the bourgeoisie can celebrate this anniversary . . ." In 1931, in the heat of criticism, [CPCS member] L. Novomeský wrote that the creation of the Republic was the game of "the financial captains from Paris, London, New York and elsewhere who rule the scene in capitalist Europe . . ." Only later was there talk of "ancient hopes, Cyrillo-Methodian legends, the Martin Declaration" and so forth (*Slovenské pohľady*, 11/88). In the heat of a political battle, the young 30-year old Klement Gottwald sought to win over the Slovaks in Žilina in 1926 with the appeal: "Clear Slovakia of the oppressive power of the Czech bourgeoisie!" (*Historický časopis*, 4/1965, p. 510). This was said during the same period when Dr. Tiso became Minister of Health in the coalition government of the Czechoslovak Republic on 15 January 1927.

The life of the First CSR was constantly changing and A. Hlinka and his party oscillated between a positive acceptance of the Republic and the struggle for the rights of the Slovaks. After 1930, the party was back in opposition. There were many reasons for

this. In 1931, new Slovak grammar rules were published in the spirit of the unitary Czechoslovak nation and the brutal *rapprochement* of the languages (láhev, nabídka, preca, dvacať . . .). The Ministry of Education ordered the use of these rules in all schools and all offices were to accept them. These rules were turned down by many Slovaks including the head of the Matica slovenská, J. Škultéty and, of course, the People's Party. And even in the theses of the VIth Congress of the CPCS, there was talk of the "criminal attack of the bourgeoisie" and reference was made to "political and cultural pressure." In addition we find: "We demand the right of self-determination for the Slovak nation." (*Prehľad dejín KSC na Slovensku*, Bratislava, 1971, p. 174). The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" greatly simplified historical reality when it constantly repeated that "clericals" were against the Republic. This is evident even from the meeting of 370 young Slovak intellectuals that was held to defend Slovak rights on 25-26 June 1932 in Trenčianské Teplice, where [Jozef] Lettrich, [Vladimír] Clementis, [Daniel] Okáli and Novomeský were there along with [Ferdinand] Ďurčanský. All favoured the autonomy of Slovakia for various reasons (*Dav*, 6/32, p. 76). Here and there some did so for reasons dictated by changing circumstances while A. Hlinka and Dr. Tiso did so out of conviction. Finally, on 16 October 1932, in Zvolen, the National Party of Martin Rázus, an outstanding cultural figure in Slovakia from the Lutheran community, joined the People's Party. Rázus declared in Zvolen: "We are celebrating the feast of national unity. We want for our nation what belongs to it, we want the administration of our affairs in our own hands" (*Slovák*, 18 October 1932).

In the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power," the statement that the clericals, the senior Catholic hierarchy and the priests were against the Republic, against the working class, that they followed papal encyclicals and were against socialism is constantly repeated. Yet the faithful could not accept anything else. If they were against socialism and the USSR, then it was because of the way they were presented to the world by the uncritical atheists of the time. In Slovakia, Ján Poničan wrote verses: "People, destroy the churches of God!" Neither the faithful, nor the bishops and the priests, nor the People's Party could be very enthusiastic about

this. Nor could they be enthusiastic about what was already known at that time about the way atheism was being spread in the USSR. The authors of the series again forgot that everything is related to everything. The persecution of Eastern believers was already known in the 1930s. Today they are writing openly about this in the pages of Soviet journals.

At the beginning of 1988, K.M. Kharchev, director of the Office for Church Affairs in the USSR Council of Ministers wrote in the article "Anchoring the Freedom of Conscience": "The negative phenomena of the thirties — the cult of personality, the violations of legality, the arrests and the repression had their negative impact even on the policies toward religion, the Church and the faithful. Voluntary administrative and executive decisions based on interdictions and limitations were supported and justified. The result was the collective and unjustified closing of churches, the arbitrary treatment of the clergy, the indifference toward the legal rights of the faithful and religious feeling, things that one cannot speak of today without bitterness" (*Týždenník aktualit*, No. 11/1988, pp. 4-5)

The authors of the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" should have known that if the faithful, the People's Party and the church hierarchy had apprehensions about socialism and if they warned against it, it was for very serious reasons. Horrible things were done in the name of socialism and the world knew about them. Today people are writing about them even here. At the beginning of March 1989, *Týždenník aktualit* published the article "The Mills of God Grind Slowly" (No. 10, 6-12 March 1989). This is one passage among many: "Lazar Moyseyev Kaganovich was born in 1893 in a poor Jewish family in the Kiev *gubernia* . . . He joined the Party in 1911 . . . He was elected to the Central Committee in 1918 . . . In 1933-34, he was responsible for a purge in the Party . . . From 1935 on, he was People's Commissar for Transport . . . Heavy Industry . . . He was awarded the Order of Lenin four times . . . In 1962, he was excluded from the Party . . . In November 1988, he celebrated his 95th birthday." The article on L.M. Kaganovich was written by members of the Institute of the History of the CPSU. According to the article, L.M. Kaganovich was excluded unanimously at the meeting of the Bureau of the Moscow Com-

mittee of the Party on 23 May 1962. At his exclusion, one of the members of the Bureau said directly to Kaganovich: "Your signature is on the files of more than 30,000 members of the Party, the Soviets, the Army, heavy industries and transportation who were sentenced to death by shooting . . ." One finds further in the article: "According to the documents signed by Stalin, Kaganovich and Beria, some 230,000 people were shot." N. Dygaj, another member of the Bureau said to Kaganovich: "I remember how, after your visit in Nizhny Tagif, the head of the NKVD shot himself. He did not kill himself, he lived a number of days and explained his act: 'I cannot manufacture enemies anymore' " (*Týždenník aktualit*, 10/89, pp. 12-13).

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" said with pathos that Pope Pius XI with his encyclical *Divini redemptoris* about Communism blessed all measures by the People's Party against socialism. The series does not say, of course, that it was published against the type of socialism in which Stalin, Kaganovich and Beria transformed hundreds of churches into museums, coffee houses, archives and barns (*Ogonok*, 50/88, pp. 3-5). At that time, the Pope also published *Mit brennender Sorge*, the encyclical against Nazism.

According to the series, 2000 priests were supposedly presidents or secretaries of organizations of the HSPP. That was about the total number of priests in Slovakia. Hundreds of them were not involved in this type of activity; others, like Bishop Kmet'ko, were attracted to the Slovak branch of the Czech People's Party. There were serious historical reasons for the involvement of priests in political activity. The authors of the series did not take this into consideration. They saw in these activities only a struggle for power at a time when Hitler was still being informed about the historical realities in Slovakia so that he could respect them. In a report sent to Berlin in February 1943, one reads: "The front rank that the clergy has in the Slovak nation can be explained on the basis of historical development . . . When the Slovaks were in Hungary . . . the clergy was directly in contact with the nation . . . It was given the leading role in the Slovak nation. And in the Slovak People's Party, founded at the beginning of the century,

the clergy had a position of pre-eminence'' (*Slovenské národné povstanie. Dokumenty*, Bratislava, 1965, p. 52).

The series ''The Cross in the Snares of Power'' did not attack only bishops, priests and the faithful in Slovakia. It also attacked bishops and the Church in the Czechs Lands and Moravia, Czechs and generally the First Republic, so that few were spared. According to the series, the Czech Catholic hierarchy cooperated with the Slovak bourgeoisie. There was, according to the series, almost nothing good in the First Republic. The chimneys of factories belched forth and people were exploited. The global economic crisis with which the entire world was dealing was simplified beyond recognition. The relations between Czechs and Slovaks were also simplified. The Czechs were enemies who were closing Slovak industries. In the meantime, the Slovaks were in fact reading [works by] Karel Čapek and other worthwhile Czech books, Slovak Catholics were working together with the Czechs in many areas, their annual Catholic day was celebrated in Prague in the presence of [Jean] Cardinal Verdier from Paris, and there were good Czech educators and professors in Slovakia who helped the Slovaks a great deal.

Of course, the television series ''The Cross in the Snares of Power'' saw in these relations only ''the bourgeoisie and clericalism''. In the innumerable shots of vaults, churches, religious services, the figures of bishops, A. Hlinka and others, they repeated that the Slovak clericals wanted to break up the Republic and that, in the end, they did break it up. In actual fact, to the extent that the People's Party did continuously fight for the autonomy of Slovakia, it was not against the CSR. When T.G. Masaryk stepped down in 1935, on 14 December of that year, E. Beneš was elected the next President as a result ''of the votes of the Populists and the Slovak Agrarians,' according to a historian (*Slovensko, Dejiny*, Bratislava, 1971, p. 693 — hereafter *Dejiny*). Among the Populists, Dr. Tiso had the merit of achieving this result, something that would some years later cost him his life. The new President, who had promised autonomy within a year, did not bring it about. The situation had not changed, the struggle continued. According to the same historian: ''some months later, the opposition could publish statistics which showed that if the government maintained the rate

with which they filled positions in central offices, which at that time were occupied by 1.13% of Slovaks, it would take the Slovaks a few hundred years to fill enough of them to attain the level to which they were entitled on the basis of population . . . It is not easy to explain the unbelievable passivity of the government's social policy in the Slovak case at such a critical time . . . " (*Dejiny*, p. 693).

The year 1938 was to be a jubilee year in the CSR — the 20th anniversary of the creation of the Republic. Officially, the accent was supposed to be on the unity of the Czechoslovak state and the Czechoslovak nation. The Slovaks did not accept Czechoslovak national unity and pushed for the individuality of the Slovak nation living together with the Czech nation. They based themselves on the Pittsburgh Agreement and the constant will of the Slovak nation. The most thoughtful people in the Czech Lands and Moravia made an effort to understand this national feeling and did so also for the good of their mutual life in the Republic.

There were many major changes in Central Europe in 1938. In March, Austria was annexed to the German Reich. Slovakia became its immediate neighbor and the entire CSR found herself encircled. Germany became the leading power in Central Europe. Courting her favour were such countries as Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia . . . To connect the Slovak struggle for autonomy with Hitler is a historically false perspective — this struggle had begun before Hitler and would have continued without him. The politicians of the People's Party rejected Nazi neopaganism and after the assassination of [Austrian Chancellor Engelbert] Dollfuss in Austria, they wrote: "These swastika national socialists are the worst danger that can upset the uncertain balance in Europe . . . and peace in Europe" (*Slovák*, 1 August 1934).

When in June 1938 the People's Party submitted another proposal for the autonomy of Slovakia which was also made in order to strengthen the domestic situation in a Republic caught in the middle of a Europe threatened by the spectre of Hitler, it received help from of a delegation of Slovak associations in the USA which, on a visit to Slovakia, brought along the original copy of the Pittsburgh Agreement. A. Hlinka appeared in public with them for the last time on 5 June; he died on 16 August 1938 in Ružomberok.

The demand for autonomy was welcomed by the nation. When the votes for the CPCS fell in Bratislava in the election of 1938 from 5,000 to 2,800 — some 45% — V. Široký explained that they [the Communists] had not defended national interests at a time when "in Slovakia the representatives of the national interests of the Slovak people continued to be the Hlinka Party" (F. Beer, A. Benčík, B. Graca, J. Křen, *Dejinná križovatka*, Bratislava, 1964, p. 27).

Hitler's strong anti-Czechoslovak speech of 12 September 1938 was a signal for some Sudeten Germans, the Henlein group, to take action. On 13 September, groups favorably inclined to Hitler created disturbances in frontier territories, occupied railway stations, post offices and so forth. The Czechoslovak government responded with the imposition of martial law. [Konrad] Henlein, the leader of the Sudeten Germans, sent a written request to Hitler that he immediately occupy the frontier territories of Czechoslovakia. Hitler included the territorial demands of Poland and Hungary on the CSR . . . On 23 September 1938, the Czechoslovak government issued a mobilization decree (*Dejiny*, p. 704).

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" claimed that the People's Party agreed and collaborated with the Henlein Party to break up the Republic. An historian writes: "The People's Party . . . after the Henlein putsch, in a public declaration took its distance from such a violent solution" (*Dejiny*, p. 706).

An avalanche of events began to occur in September 1938. [British and French] Foreign Ministers [Neville] Chamberlain and [Edouard] Daladier, by offering concessions, wanted to save Europe from war. The Czechoslovak government accepted a proposal of mediation by four great powers; Italy, Germany, England and France. Their conference was held on 29 September 1938 in Munich. The result was the ceding of the Sudetenland to Germany. An additional article to the agreement obliged the CSR to reach an agreement with the Polish and Hungarian governments about their demands . . . "The Czechoslovak government decided on 30 September, in the presence of President Beneš, to accept the Munich diktat . . ." (*Dejiny*, p. 705).

The series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" strengthened its attack with pictures and comments against "clericalism and the

Church in Slovakia," especially in connection with the proclamation of autonomy. According to the series, the "clericals" made a pact with the fascists to break up the CSR. An historian nevertheless notes: "Throughout 1938, the HSPP negotiated regularly with the government, with Beneš, to broaden the self-administration of Slovakia, to achieve autonomy and to enter the government. That is the difference in the positions of the HSPP and the Henlein Party who basically did not want the government to fulfill their demands . . ." (*Dejiny*, p. 700).

In October 1938, the autonomy of Slovakia became the aim of all political parties and all Slovaks. A national meeting of the representatives of the HSPP was called on 6 October 1938 in Žilina to which the representatives of other parties also came uninvited. Already on 4 October, Dr. I. Dérer, once its greatest opponent, had proposed autonomy in Bratislava. The Agrarian Party submitted two proposals on autonomy on 4 and 5 October. Dr. Vladimír Clementis was negotiating with the president of the National Party to allow members of the CPCS to join through it the all-Slovak autonomy government. This did not happen (Testimony of M. Korman, editor-in-chief of *Robotnícke noviny, Čas*, 7 January 1947). The representatives of Slovakia present in Žilina prepared the so-called Žilina Agreement on which the autonomy of Slovakia was based and the first autonomous Slovak government was formed. From its five members, two were from the People's Party (Tiso and Ďurčanský, two from the Agrarian Party ([Pavol] Teplanský and [Ján] Lichner), and one from the National Party (M. Černák). The negotiations were quite spontaneous and old enmities were forgotten. A national reconciliation took place which had no precedent in Slovakia. The newspapers of all political parties singled out this generosity. There was a feeling of satisfaction in the Czech Lands that the Republic had been saved. Ferdinand Petrouška, one of the leading journalists, wrote in the journal *Prítomnosť*: "We have to be . . . grateful that the Slovaks, so long as they are led by the People's Party, are completely determined to stay in the Republic, to be a part of its framework, even if more loose. This is something which we must value deeply" (L. Lipscher, *Ludácka autonómia*, Bratislava 1957, p. 143). Autonomy came about in Slovakia without

repression against the former enemies, without arrests, without blood and without forced emigration.

Immediately after the proclamation of the autonomy of Slovakia, the autonomous government left for Prague. President Beneš had already resigned on 5 October. In his parting speech, influenced by the events that had fallen over Europe, he said: "It is unavoidable above all to come to an agreement with the Slovaks . . . irrespective of this or that circumstance" (Š. Osuský, *Beneš a Slovensko*, London, 1943). The central government in Prague immediately approved the decisions taken in Žilina, the autonomy of Slovakia and the autonomous Slovak government. Already on 6 October, the government of General [Ján] Sirový in Prague had approved by telegram Dr. Jozef Tiso as Minister for Slovakia. On the following day, it approved the other members of the autonomous government. A similar government was formed in Ruthenia. It is with these actions that Slovakia achieved autonomy in the CSR. Archbishop Kmet'ko was asked the following question during his testimony on 7 January 1947: "Did you consider the agreement of 6 October as the beginning of the break up of the CSR or as an attempt to save the Republic?". He answered: "The HSPP at the end of these developments had achieved the most it had hoped for and at the meeting of the deputies there was a declaration to the effect that we would not go any further."

All of this was taking place, for the CSR but especially for Slovakia, in the shadow of the unsuccessful negotiations in Komárno. In Germany, the so-called Vienna Award followed, according to which [Foreign] Ministers [Joachim von] Ribbentrop [of Germany] and [Galeazzo] Ciano [of Italy] decided to annex the southern territories of Slovakia to Hungary. This happened on 2 November 1938. On 8 November, there was an agreement between representatives of the Slovak People's and the Agrarian Parties. The declaration and creation of an *all-national* party were also signed by the Czechoslovak People's party, the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party and the Czechoslovak National Democratic party. This is how a Party of Slovak National Unity was created. During the election for the autonomous Slovak Diet, 97.5% of voters voted "yes". Shortly thereafter, so-called state secretariats were created in Prague in all ministries and the central government promised to create 4000

positions in the army for Slovak officers "because up to that point, only 4% of the officer corps was Slovak" (*Dejiny*, p. 709). Slovakia's relations with the Republic at the end of these struggles remained open and correct. During the Christmas holidays, when the President, Dr. E. Hácha, with members of the central government from Prague, came to Slovakia on the invitation of the Slovak government, he was welcomed in Bratislava with attention and respect as head of state; this was a sign of brotherly peace. This was also the basic approach of priests and lay believers toward the Republic, toward the Czech Lands and Moravia after the attainment of autonomy. Unfortunately, the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" did not know anything about these positive historical facts and did not show any of them to the public.

The series showed the greatest degree of fantasy in describing the events around the Slovak State, its creation and life in it. Everything was directed against religion and the Church. Here pictures flashed even faster — pictures of churches and masses, figures of bishops alternating with shootings and dead bodies, as the supposed fruits of the Church in Slovakia. Everything here was simplified as reprehensible and commented upon one-sidedly. The only answer to this wave of pictures and words dictated by hatred is the immutable testimony of historical documents.

Historians have concluded that the immediate result of the Munich Agreement of 30 September was an outright change in the political conditions in Central Europe. It ceased to be the sphere of interest and influence of the Western powers and came under the exclusive influence of Hitler. In this way, the fate of the states of this area was sealed. Upon acquiring power, Hitler became literally feared. If statesmen could not incur his favour, there wasn't one who would have wanted to be in conflict with him. If Slovak or Czech politicians had tried to do so after Munich, they would have put their nations in direct mortal danger. The President of the CSR, E. Beneš, gave up his office in the face of such a hopeless situation and emigrated to Great Britain.

Historians know that Hitler, who had set his goals long before, continued, even after the Munich Conference, in his policy of breaking up Central Europe. In various ways, he encouraged the Slovaks to go beyond autonomy, then he warned the Czechs about the

Slovaks and indirectly incited the former against the latter. In this kind of atmosphere, a number of ministers in Prague were preparing as early as December 1938 the military overthrow of the autonomous government of Slovakia. The preparations were described by one of the participants (L. Feierabend, *Ve vládách Druhé republiky*, New York, 1961, pp. 110, 122, 137). On the other hand, Hitler was giving hopes to Hungary and Poland about the possible partition of Slovakia. In this way, he created an atmosphere of tension and uncertainty in the entire area, in which he was the deciding factor. In this unclear situation, the government in Prague and President Hácha decided during the night of 10 March 1939 to take an exceptionally serious step to strengthen the Republic: they overthrew the Slovak autonomous government and established a military dictatorship in Slovakia (*Dejiny*, p. 712). Up to 300 people, ministers, senior bureaucrats, deputies and others were brought to Moravia and imprisoned.

The military coup of 10 March 1939, the imprisonment of members of the autonomous government and of deputies, without regard for their parliamentary immunity, martial law and shootings, these were all unfortunate acts which Hitler not only observed, but also supported and used for his purposes. In the meantime, he gave a free hand to the Czech Lands and in this way encouraged the Czechs. To the Slovaks, he offered himself as a saviour before the Czechs and other neighbours.

After the military coup of 10 March, the Slovaks, of course, did not turn officially to Hitler for help as many expected and as has since been falsely claimed. Amazingly, the Slovaks kept their heads. Dr. Tiso accepted his dismissal and took off with his briefcase in hand for Bánovce. President Hácha then named a new autonomous government led by [Karol] Sidor. The latter refused Hitler's demand that he proclaim the independence of Slovakia. Only then did Hitler invite Dr. Tiso to Berlin. After consultation with government officials and with their consent, he accepted the invitation on 13 March 1939 and flew to Berlin.

Half a century later on 15 March 1989, an historian wrote about the meeting between Hitler and Dr. Tiso: "During a 35-minute discussion, Hitler put him before the following alternative: either you declare Slovakia's independence, or he (Hitler) will leave

Slovakia to her fate . . . ” In addition, he gave Tiso for signature a prepared text for a declaration of independence. During the discussion, Ribbentrop brought the news that Hungarian troops were being assembled on the southern borders of Slovakia . . . Hitler then said to Tiso that it was important to act “blitzschnell — with lightning speed”. The historian concludes: “J. Tiso, sticking to his evolutionary theory, refused to take upon himself the responsibility. He left the decision to the Slovak Diet” (*Pravda*, March 1989). This meant making a call to the new Prime Minister of the autonomous government, K. Sidor, with the request that President Háchá summon the Slovak Diet into session in Bratislava in accordance with the Constitution. Only then, by a decision of the Slovak Diet, under these difficult circumstances and the pressure of time, it came on 14 March to a unanimous vote and after the hour of noon to the declaration of the *Slovak State*.

Only a few hours after Dr. Tiso [met Hitler], President Háchá and his Foreign Minister, [František] Chvalkovský, experienced how difficult it was to deal with the dictator Hitler in Berlin. After brutal pressure and threats, they signed the text submitted to them for the liquidation of the CSR and the capitulation of her army. Dr. Chvalkovský then said, with tears in his eyes, that they had saved the nation from ruin because Hitler’s armies were already at the frontiers of the Republic. It will remain forever a historical fact that a Catholic priest, a member of the People’s Party and a responsible politician, was able in these horrible times to resist Hitler’s pressure to declare the independence of Slovakia and the creation of a state and to leave this decision to the constitutional Slovak Diet which had been called into session by the President of the CSR. President Háchá, by then a broken man, and the Foreign Minister of the Republic did not have in this situation of pressure and threats enough strength to oppose the dictator; they signed the destruction of the state. This is all part of inalterable history. On 15 March 1939, the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia was created and Ruthenia also declared her independence. On 15 March, even before the return of Dr. Háchá, Hitler and his army showed up in Prague. Hungarian forces appeared in Ruthenia and occupied the country. They also penetrated Slovakia and bombarded Spisšská Nová Ves. Hitler supported all along their demands

and the barely-born Slovak Republic had to give up part of her territory in the east up to Sobrance [to Hungary].

If the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" showed the creation of the Slovak State only through images of horror, this has nothing in common with historical facts. A few pictures of broken windows had nothing to do with the Slovak Republic, but rather with the military coup of 10 March 1939. An historian writes: "The new . . . Slovak government, led by Tiso, which achieved power on 14 March 1939, did not meet with any opposition. Even the commanders of military units in Slovakia accepted its authority, as did the police, and state officials" (*Dejiny*, p. 713). When an historian thinks of the conditions and the different ways under which states were created in recent history, what bloodletting accompanied the creation of the states of India and Pakistan, what loss of life accompanies the liberation movements in San Salvador or in the Philippines, how much blood was shed to change the regimes in Iran, Ethiopia or in Pol Pot's Cambodia, then one thing must be clear to him: whatever may have been the pressures or the threats from outside when the Slovak Republic was created, within Slovakia it happened without a single shot, without the loss of blood and with the summons from legal Slovak politicians for national unification.

Even if the television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" could have put together the worst possible pictures, it could not have changed this basic historical reality.

It is not possible in one letter to take a position on all of the half-truths and untruths about the Slovak State, life in it, especially concerning its relations with the Church, the bishops, priests and the faithful which the series presented in a disfigured form. Nevertheless, there are certain points that must be made. In the first place, there was not a priest in any Slovak government. The President was a priest, whose power was constitutionally different from the executive power of the government. The members of the government were lay people who had not received a mandate from the Church, rather whose mandate came from elections. Neither in the Slovak Parliament, nor in the government were there only Catholics. In actual fact, in the confused situation of the time, not only Catholics but also many other Slovaks saw in the nomination

of Dr. Tiso as President the best guarantee against the danger of Nazism.

As far as the relations between the Church and the Slovak State are concerned, Archbishop Kmet'ko described the Church's position in his testimony before the National Tribunal on 6 January 1947 as follows: "When we belonged to the Hungarian State, we had to recognize it and behave accordingly. When the Czechoslovak Republic was created, we honored and recognized it also. When the Slovak State came into existence, a state which was internationally recognized, among others also by Russia, we recognized it too" (The entire text of this testimony was published in *Katolícke noviny* in the spring of 1947).

Bishops, priests and believers could not recognize this state as "so-called." In his testimony, Archbishop Kmet'ko stated that "If someone had said of that state that he does not recognize it, they would have taken care of him." The Church had, however, not only internal reasons for recognizing the Slovak Republic, but also international ones. From the approximately 50 existing states at that time, the Slovak Republic was recognized by thirty. Among them were Switzerland, Great Britain, France, China, Belgium, Sweden, Liberia, Ecuador and others. Later, when the Soviet-German agreement was signed on 23 August 1939, the Soviet Union recognized the Slovak Republic *de facto* and *de jure* and established diplomatic relations with it. At that same time, the Czechoslovak embassy in Moscow was closed and Ambassador Z. Fierlinger was dismissed. He left for London. The Soviet Embassy opened its doors in January 1940 in Bratislava, headed by the career diplomat G. Pushkin.

The question of the absolute independence or the relative freedom of action of the government of the Slovak Republic was not a decisive factor in the attitude of the Church toward that state. Since the time of Great Moravia, neither the Czech Lands, nor Moravia nor Slovakia enjoyed absolute independence and freedom, given their geopolitical position between East and West. Nevertheless, the states in which our nations lived had to be inevitably respected. One could not dismiss the Slovak State simply because it did not have the attributes of absolute independence. Dr. Kmet'ko expressed this before the tribunal as follows: "If you do not ac-

cept [independence], we will divide you into three parts." Half a century later, it is possible to attack and compile the deficiencies, errors and the offenses of the authors of that state, but at the time, its recognition was the only responsible option even for the Church. Before the National Tribunal, Dr. [Juraj] Šujan put to Archbishop Kmet'ko on 6 January 1947 the following question: "What did the Slovak State give the Slovak nation from the moral point of view? Did it give anything positive?" Dr. Kmet'ko answered: "Is there such a nation that would not want to have independence? Can you imagine a poor man who would not like to have his own little house but would rather depend on someone else? The answer that everyone would give is that it is impossible to imagine such a nation, such an individual." Dr. Šujan continued: "But that independence was a dependence." Dr. Kmet'ko answered: "But it was ten times better than the Protectorate [of Bohemia-Moravia]."

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" collected reproaches and judgments, qualified the Slovak State as "clero-fascist" and presented events in such a way as to suggest that it had enthusiastically sent Slovak soldiers into Poland. The historical reality was much more complex, and was such that the Slovak State had to live and develop in the terrible conditions of the Europe of the time, conditions which were complicated and downright confused. On 23 August 1939, [Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav] Molotov and Ribbentrop signed a non-aggression pact in which there was also a clause about Poland. Hitler attacked Poland on 1 September 1939, from the west and the south. The Soviet Union entered Poland from the east on 17 September 1939. Military engagements lasted barely three weeks before Poland was divided between Germany and the USSR. The battle for Poland started the Second World War. The Slovak Republic did not seek conquests, refused to improve its frontiers with Poland and took only some small territories lost in 1918 and 1938. One can only regret the participation of Slovak soldiers in the battles in Poland. Unfortunately, even before and after, the armies of fraternal nations attacked a country from both sides, not only when the nations but also their governments were decidedly opposed.

The domestic life of the Slovak Republic was not without problems. As in other nations, there were also individuals in Slovakia

who were too radical, who began to complicate life by cooperating with the Nazis, whether out of national or personal motives. Vojtech Tuka and his group belonged to this radical wing. And in the cities and in the towns there were always egotistical and rough individuals of various backgrounds ready to serve anyone. The radicals pressured for the solution of the question of Slovakia's Jewish citizens. The President and the majority in the government were opposed to this.

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" reproached the Slovak State and the Church hierarchy in Slovakia for being guided by the encyclicals. The Nazis made the same reproach. The German envoy [Hans] Bernard sent a report to Berlin, dated 30 June 1940, indicating that Slovak legislation was based on *Quadragesimo anno*, and that "that in itself is against the interests of the Reich, just like the Jewish legislation which rejects the racial idea is against the interests of Germany." This brought about a negative reaction from [German Nazi leaders Heinrich] Himmler and [Martin] Bormann. When envoy Bernard was recalled to Berlin on 28 May 1940 and did not return to Bratislava, a feeling of uncertainty developed in Slovakia as to what would happen; people were counting with the worst.

In order to keep the radical groups under control, President Tiso introduced an authoritarian system in January 1940, something for which the series reproached him derisively. According to him and to many others, it was the only way at the time for the President to keep radical centrifugal attempts within tolerable bounds, especially where Prime Minister Tuka and certain people in the Hlinka Guard were concerned. On 21 January 1940, in an address, the President spoke severely of [the need for] discipline. When Ribbentrop recalled the German envoy from Bratislava in May 1940 as a form of protest for the slowness on the part of the Slovak government in the introduction of [certain] measures, especially towards the Jews, the President argued for the need for order in the state. He sought to alleviate the suspicions on the German side with the words: "I personally guarantee the completely friendly attitude of Slovakia towards Germany." One can laugh at these words today, but at that time, when everything was at stake, when radical individuals presented the President to German officials as

unreliable and wanted to reinforce [the position of] V. Tuka, the President did not have any other option than to defend the Slovak nation (*Documents on German Foreign Policy*, 371/208155).

All of this was taking place at the time when Hitler began his major offensive against the West on 10 May 1940 — on 13 May, Holland capitulated, Belgium on 28 May and France on 22 June. In the middle of these events, President Tiso stated on 30 June 1940 at a meeting of Catholic university students in Prešov: "We Catholics do not have to learn anything from anyone, we have our own system . . . Catholicism and not Nazism has to penetrate all aspects of our life . . . Our politics must be led by Catholicism. Any other politics would be gangster politics and the Slovak nation will not allow gangster politics because it knows where such politics lead . . . Without Catholic morality there is no culture, no humanity. In spiritual needs, we Catholics have to be self-sufficient so that in these very needs we are not condemned to import foreign ideologies" (*Slovák*, 2 July 1940). At the time of Hitler's victories in the West, these were far too courageous words and they expressed a far too moderate style of politics. His enemies used them against him.

It is under these circumstances and because of the tension between the moderate President and the radical V. Tuka that an invitation to come to Salzburg on 27 and 28 July 1940 was made where the President was humiliated and where the power of Tuka grew, immediately after a meeting with Hitler. Upon his return from Salzburg, V. Tuka announced at a demonstration in Bratislava that "a new era of Slovak National Socialism had begun." The President, humiliated and scorned, seriously thought for the first time of resigning his office. Only after many entreaties did he change his intention. Among others, Laco Novomeský said to one of the deputies of the Slovak parliament: "For God's sake, do everything so that the President does not resign. This would mean the end of us all."

It was only after the Salzburg defeat of the President and the strengthening of the position of Prime Minister Tuka that the latter was able to pass a stronger law for the solution of the Jewish question by the government. It is in this way that a free government was able to publish the so-called Jewish Code in September

1940 in the form of a governmental decree, without the signature of the President. The Code was against all basic human and Christian principles. There remained only a small hope; in comparison with the anti-Jewish laws of Germany and states like Italy, France, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Holland, Denmark, Norway, saying nothing of states directly incorporated into the Reich like Austria, the protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia and the Polish General Government, the Slovak Code had two elements that were different: the president of the Republic was provided with the right to grant administrative exceptions to this law to anyone (Paragraph X, Article 225) and secondly to put into effect all exceptions which he had previously granted (Article 256). This was the only not unmeaningful dam, in the given situation of pressure and violence, against the torrent of injustice. And this was the reason why the President, upon the entreaties of many people, did not, for the second time, resign his office.

On 7 October 1941, Catholic Bishops submitted to the President a memorandum of protest after the publication of the so-called Jewish Code. A similar memorandum was submitted to the President and to Parliament by the Association of Lutheran Pastors. On 12 March 1942, Catholic Bishops addressed another letter of protest to the government against the contemplated deportation of the Jews from Slovakia. At the session of the State Council on 23 March 1942, Ján Pöstényi, together with J. Balko expressed a very critical and oppositional point of view against the contemplated deportation of Jewish citizens from Slovakia. Then came the interventions from the Vatican.

When the first transports of Jewish citizens began to leave in March and April for Poland, Catholic newspapers published on 26 April 1942, on the demand of the bishops, an article defending the Jews. The deportations were considered by them to be an anti-constitutional and immoral act of collective punishment without a judicial sentence on guilt or innocence. At that time, no one knew that the condemned Jewish citizens were not leaving for work, but that they would be the victims of a diabolical liquidation in Hitler's death camps.

German officials considered the measures against the Jews in Slovakia to be sluggish. In the telegram that envoy Ludin sent to

Berlin, dated 26 June 1942, one reads: "The actual evacuation of the Jews from Slovakia has for the moment reached a dead point. Under ecclesiastical influence, and the initiative of individual officials, some 35,000 Jews received special dispensations according to which they must not be evacuated". Dr. [Anton] Neumann, head of the President's office, had the responsibility for processing and acquiescing to the exceptions. According to him, the President granted 10,000 exceptions, which with immediate family members represented approximately some 35,000 people.

In the matter of the Jewish citizens, the Church did not satisfy itself merely with the writing of memoranda and letters of protest. Dr. Kmet'ko was asked by the National Tribunal the following question: "Are you aware of the fact that through your diocesan office many exceptions for Jews were arranged?" Dr. Kmet'ko replied: "Yes, we did so through a certain professor of theology." Dr. [Ján] Žabkay asked: "Who was he?" The answer: "Dr. Ivan Murín." Dr. [Michal] Buzalka testified before the tribunal about similar demands for exceptions. In addition, Archbishop Kmet'ko said the following about Dr. Tiso in his testimony before the National Tribunal on 6 January 1947: "It is a proven fact that as President he did not sign the publication of the Jewish Code . . . I know that Jews said even to me that it is necessary that Tiso remain as President, because if he is not there, every Jew to the last one will perish . . ." (*Katolícke noviny*, 1947). Adolf Eichmann, one of the greatest criminal actors in the persecution of the Jews, during his interrogation at his trial in Israel on 22 June 1960, as noted in the minutes, spoke the following words which did not simplify his position, rather damaged it: "Tiso . . . once even said: 'I am a Catholic priest and I do not want to have anything to do with it'."

In the fall of 1942, one could read in the Reich party newsletter that the definitive liquidation of the Jews [was proceeding] "mit rücksichtsloser Härte — with ruthless toughness." At that time, not a single Jewish citizen left Slovakia for resettlement in Poland. Envoy Ludin reported from Bratislava to Berlin that the Jewish question in Slovakia was being solved "in the opposite direction" as the initiative for a proposition to change the Jewish Code shows.

The bishops in Slovakia published a new document on 8 March 1943 — a pastoral letter on the Jewish question. The letter stated

that no one can be punished without the establishment of guilt. Guilt must be proven first in each individual case according to given legal norms. This letter was read at all religious celebrations by priests. Even Dr. Tiso read it in Bánovce and he asked his chaplains to read it.

In the first days of March 1943, Bishop Vojtaššák received a report from Jewish refugees from Poland about what was happening with Slovak Jews — they were being killed shamefully and diabolically in gas chambers. Bishop Vojtaššák immediately sent an urgent letter about this matter to the Minister of the Interior and a copy to the Papal Nuncio. The government discussed the matter at once and put an end to all further transports to Poland. When German officials refused the government's request to send a government delegation to Poland to see the actual situation on the spot, the transports were *stopped* permanently.

The news of the criminal murder of the Jews in Poland in the 20th century, the century of civilization, sounded truly unbelievable. When [Dr. Gerhard] Riegner, representative of the Jewish World Congress, expressed for the first time in July 1942 the apprehension whether the deportation of Jews for work in Poland did not hide something worse, the American envoy in Switzerland, L. Harrison considered his memorandum as [spreading] "wild rumors." When Riegner also turned to E. Beneš in London, the latter considered his report to be untrue and did not recommend that it be published. Later, on 6 November 1942, Beneš notified the Jewish World Congress that after examining the matter, [he had concluded that] "the Germans were not preparing a plan for the wholesale extermination of the Jews" (W. Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret*, London, 1980, p. 163).

The solution of the Jewish question by the Slovak state is one of the worst stains that appeared at that time. Already the deportation of Jewish citizens with the initial aim of [using them for] work was against Christian morality because it was a collective punishment without the establishment of individual guilt. It is not possible to find the appropriate words of horror and condemnation for the criminal murder of these people which later followed in the gas chambers.

As far as the guilt of the President or even of the Church in Slovakia is concerned in this matter, historians, after studying a multitude of facts, are far more objective today than were the authors of the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power." This series showed the worst brutality against the Jews along with pictures and movie clips of churches, masses, bishops and the religious ceremonies of the Church. In fact, the series even showed the terrible picture of a bulldozer piling together human bones. The authors did not say, however, that the bulldozer was neither Slovak nor Catholic. Pol Pot probably used similar bulldozers in Cambodia when he introduced his version of atheism and the new social order for which he liquidated physically up to two million people.

Several Jewish authors in the examination of the question of Jewish citizens in Slovakia are more impartial. H. Arendt, in her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, wrote that the attitude toward the Jewish population in the Slovak State "differed both in style and content from Hitler's racism." According to her, the biggest reproach made to the Jews was not that they belonged to another race, but rather that they were rich, that representing 4% of the population, they owned 38% of the national wealth. When [high Nazi official Edmund] Weesenmayer came to Bratislava in December 1943 with a strict command from Hitler to continue the transports, according to H. Arendt, "Tiso did not agree to the deportations." And when Weesenmayer reappeared in 1944 and demanded that the Jews be deported, "Tiso refused again" (H. Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, New York, 1963, pp. 184-186.)

In the report of the international conference of the Red Cross about its activities in the years 1939-1947, there was reference to the deportation of Jewish citizens from Slovakia, but it was also stated that "at the same time, a big part of the Jewish minority could stay in the country and at certain times, Slovakia was even considered as a relative haven for Jews from Poland. Those Jews who stayed in Slovakia were comparatively safe until the uprising . . . at the end of August 1944" (XVI *Conférence internationale de la Croix Rouge*, Stockholm, 1948, Vol. 1).

Another rare peculiarity of Slovakia was the rabbinical institute in Nitra with a garden and courtyard where, with the knowledge of officials and the help of the bishop's office, Jewish students

studied theology throughout the existence of the Slovak State right up to the outbreak of the uprising. It was there that family members and acquaintances and Jewish refugees met (*Vestník židov. naboz. obci v ČSSR*, XXXI, March 1977, p. 6).

It was in this way that many in the Slovak State, in particular Church workers, sought to follow the advice of the President who had said on 20 January 1940 to the radicals in a speech on the theme: "The Slovak nation must remain true to its traditions": "I know that in Slovakia, . . . 99% [of the population] stand behind the idea that our programme has to be a people's Slovakia and therefore not a Nazi Slovakia. There is no reason why we should change our colours . . . We have our own Christian social programme and we will see it carried out." The next day, on 21 January 1941, *Slovak* published a letter from "a Slovak German from Bratislava" who wrote "German National Socialism, according to the statements of Reich Chancellor Hitler, was created in Germany for Germans and is not an article for export . . . Only political opportunists and those who want to flatter and thus achieve advancement are importing it to Slovakia" (*Slovák*, 21 January 1941).

When the new German envoy H.E. Ludin visited the President after 30 January 1941 and advised him against counting on the defeat of Germany, Dr. Tiso replied: "This is the tragedy of my situation: I have the feeling that I have less and less the support of the representatives of the Reich . . . It would, however, be intolerable for me to have to win this confidence with acts for which I would lose support in my nation. I would then rather give up any public activity" (*Documents on German Foreign Policy*, 1258/338145).

Throughout, the television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" did not take into consideration any aspect of the brutal struggle against the wave of evil which flooded Europe in the worst war the world has known. Everything was lumped together in the series — politicians, the government, the bishops and the Church who, according to the series, all wanted to do evil and did evil. They were "clero-fascists" according to the series. This is not a term from historiography; its usage is political and as such, objective historians consider it useless. If Dr. Tiso shook hands with Hitler or with Ribbontrop, as the series showed on many occasions,

he did so out of the necessity of his office. But this does not mean that in so doing he became a Nazi. When the President of Czechoslovakia shakes hands with officials from the Vatican or from the U.S.A., it does not mean that he becomes a believer or a capitalist. As a public official of the state, President Tiso had to meet even Nazis, he had to cover moderate acts with strong words. Even today, politicians speak somewhat differently and act differently. Yet in the shadow of the President and many members of the government, Slovak farmers plowed and sowed in peace, professors lectured, students studied, mothers cooked for their children, and poets and writers published books like never before. And all of these took place on an island around which the worst war raged. If it is the duty of politicians to protect their nation, who would have in such a desperate situation done better! Later I will refer to the evaluations by the opposition.

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" showed life in the Slovak State to be directed by traitors to the nation, criminals who exploited and surrendered their country to the Germans and sent their people to their death, all with the blessing of high officials and the Church. In fact, there was not one execution in the Slovak State because the President did not sign even one death warrant. This was not self-evident — during this cruel war, in the years 1939-45, even in Switzerland thirty condemned people were executed for threatening the state economically, militarily or politically (*Nachrichtenzentrum Schweiz*, Franefeld n. Stuttgart, 1972, p. 24).

The series also attacked the supposed connection between the bishops and clergy and the Nazis and the fact that in the Catholic university residence "Svoradov" they were educating young intellectuals to become Nazis. In fact, in the report of the German envoy in Bratislava to Berlin in February 1943, one reads; "the bastion . . . of anti-German feeling is the Catholic student residence Svoradov . . ." There was also a comment about the Jesuits in the report: "It is not necessary to underline that the position of the Jesuits is absolutely anti-German . . ." Bishop Buzalka, head of the Catholic Action, is also mentioned as one "whose anti-German feeling is known" (*Slovenské Národné Povstanie, Dokumenty*, [no. 3], Bratislava, 1965, p. 52ff. Hereafter *Dokumenty*). In contemporary

terminology, the term "anti-German" evidently meant "anti-Nazi". One can also see from the same report to Berlin how closely thinking in Slovakia was being followed. In annex no. 11, there was for example a summary of quotations from Slovak Catholic and Lutheran journals "which seemed to the Nazis to be in conflict with Nazi ideology" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 3], p. 45 and underlined in the original).

If the television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" showed and with comments described after fifty years the Slovak State as having been evil and nothing else but evil, contemporary opposition [groups] saw matters much more soberly. In a report to Czechoslovak circles in London dated 5 March 1943 from [Viliam] Radakovič in Istanbul, we read: "The government is still divided into two groups . . . The Tiso faction, to whom it seems that the interests of the Slovak people do matter after all, has a different tactic. It gives to the Germans only what it must and is governed by the motto: "Let the wolf eat enough and the lamb will survive" . . . On the basis of available evidence, one can say in general, that even though not much, the Tiso faction dominates anyway" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 5], p.61).

In a report sent at the end of 1943 to Czechoslovak circles in London, Miloš Ruppeldt, a member of one of the opposition groups, studying in Madrid, wrote: "Members of Svoradov are trying to be in favor of the state and would like to keep at any cost full state independence. They agree with the others only in their opposition to the Germans . . . It is a generation with a new [national] consciousness and they come principally from rural Catholic families . . . Politically they try to be tolerant toward Slovaks of other political persuasions, as well as towards the Czechs . . . Today, more than 300 university students study abroad among whom only a small percentage is recruited from this group" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 55], p. 183).

Some years ago, historians had already concluded about the Slovak Republic that "the regime was moderate within the framework of its type . . . liberal towards those who had the luck of being born in a Slovak or German as well as a Christian family." It represented 95.66% of the population (L. Lipták, *Slovensko v 20. storočí*, Bratislava, 1968, p. 211). S. Falt'an wrote: "A specific

Slovak characteristic was that on the one hand Communists were imprisoned and tortured but after being charged they were released and let free. And they were even able to stay in economic and state institutions after their release" (*Slovenská otázka v Československu*, Bratislava, 1968, p. 114). In intelligence reports from Istanbul from September 1944 for Czechoslovak circles in London, one reads that according to the judgment of Laco Novomeský [which he expressed] in 1944 "the last five years were not years of stagnation either in culture or in the economy in Slovakia. The Slovaks educated a solid stratum of the intelligentsia" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 260], p. 457).

In the above-mentioned report for Czechoslovak circles in London from the end of 1943, M. Ruppeldt writes the following in conclusion: "In many respects, in the last five years, Slovakia moved ahead. Today it is in a very anti-German mood . . . The Slovak government still has a strong enough position to resist the Germans. It is thanks to this position, for example, that after [Field Marshal Wilhelm] Keitel's visit there was no general mobilization, which is what the visit was all about . . . Ruling circles . . . follow a policy of utilitarian nationalism . . . It cannot be denied that under the influence of today's favorable economic situation in Slovakia the conviction reigns in broad strata [of the population] that even after the war Slovakia would be able to survive independently. The idea of a Czechoslovak nation will hardly find any ground even among the former representatives of this idea among us. It would be dangerous to want all of a sudden by legislative action to carry out something against which current developments and circumstances have worked" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 55], p. 186). According to the same report: "literature and art have not shown a visible decline. Theatre seems to have the greatest difficulties. In drama and opera there are beautiful translations by Rázusová-Martaková. New plays: *Jánošík* . . . *Tanec nad plačom*, Stodola's piece *Mravci a cvrčkovia* . . . Rysul'a has put out nice novels . . . Dominik Tatarka had success with his *Úzkosti hľadania*, new editions of old works are being published (Hronský, Urban, Figuli, Rázus) . . . Closet pacifists . . . come forward in literary journals (*Elán*, *Tvorba*, *Pohlady*). Among them are Miloš Krno, Štiavnický, Procházka. From the older generation, one hears more often today from Smrek, Lukáč, Kostra . . . In music, Suchoň, young Cíkner . . . also Kar-

doš and Moyzes have noticeable success'' (*Dokumenty*, [no. 55], p. 182).

Among active artists during the Slovak State one finds also Martin Benka. He returned to [Turčiansky Sväty] Martin from Prague in 1939. During the years 1940-41, he directed the art and drawing section of the SVST in Bratislava and presided over the Association of Slovak Creative Artists. Many other poets also published their literary works during the Slovak State: Ján Poničan published in 1941 his composition *Divný Jánko*, in 1943 *Sen na medzi*. Laco Novomeský published in 1939 his collection *Sväty za dedinou*, in the years 1940-41 he published in *Elán* a cycle of poems which came out later under the title *Pašovanou ceruskou*. Jan Kostra published the collections *Moja rodná*, *Ozubený čas*, *Všetko je dobre tak*, *Puknutá váza*, *Ave Eva*, *Vietor nad cestou*, and all of this in the years 1939-43. Others who published were Ľudo Ondrejov, Margita Figuli. Andrej Plávka published in 1941 his novel *Obrátenie Pavla* and in 1942 the collection *Tri prúty Liptova*. In 1942, František Hečko published the collection *Na pravé poludnie*. Also active poetically was Pavol Horov — he published *Nioba, naša matka* and *Zradné vody spodné* (1941, 1942) and then in 1944 *Návraty*.

All of the surrealists also published during the Slovak State — V. Reisel, J. Lenko, Štefan Žáry, Ján Rak, Pavel Bunčák, Ján Brezina, Ivan Kupec. Some of their collective works were also published. Among prose writers, D. Tatarka and others published their works. Ján Smrek edited *Elán* for which A. Matuška, M. Považan M. Chorvát and others wrote essays.

If the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" described the life of the nation in the Slovak State as life under the leadership of criminals who with the help of the Church despoiled everything and took the nation to the bottom, historical documents speak otherwise. In the collection of documents that was published in 1984 one also finds the "Report of the V illegal Central Committee of the CPS [Communist Party of Slovakia] on developments in Slovakia after 6 October 1938 which Karol Bacílek brought to Moscow for the information of the Moscow leadership of the CPCS for discussion." It was written on 7 July 1944 and we find in it among other things: "Today, there are enough goods in Slovakia, the supply of food is generally good and compared to other lands

(the Czech Lands, Hungary, Germany, Poland) the situation is the best in Slovakia, and this also includes the level of salaries as well as the possibility of purchasing goods. The wages of employees and workers were raised many times, factories have many supply privileges and one cannot even speak of a shortage of basic consumer goods. The Slovak crown is the best currency in commercial Europe and enjoys at home for the moment complete confidence. People are saving money and there is no move to a barter system such as one observes in surrounding countries . . . The prices of essential goods on the black market are on average 20% more than official prices, and are often at the official level whereas for example in the Czech Lands they are 100-200% higher . . . Slovak industry in certain favorable circumstances . . . was greatly modernized . . . Czech currency is completely ruined whereas Slovak currency is properly holding its own" (*Dejiny Slovenského národného povstania 1944*, Bratislava 1984, Vol. III, Document 228, p. 338).

When the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" reached the outbreak of the uprising, it raised the tone of the organ music and the frequency of pictures with crosses, altars, statues and religious offices. The announcer said that the entire Church hierarchy was tied to the clero-fascist state and that all efforts of cooperation with the bishops for the beginning of the struggle against Fascism failed. It was ironically stated that Bishop [Andrej] Škrábik refused to cooperate because he was interested in the salvation of souls. The irony was out of place. During the war years, the bishops rarely dealt with politics, only when it was inevitable. The absolute majority of priests were dedicated to their spiritual activities — they took care of churches, celebrated religious offices, baptized, performed marriage ceremonies and funerals, prepared their sermons and heard confessions, taught religion in schools, offered spiritual renewal, retreats and popular missions. Slovak bishops protested against the breaking of laws and rights in the same way bishops are doing today in South Africa and elsewhere; it was not their vocation to take up arms, not anymore than it is that of the bishops of Africa. If they were against Nazism and its neo-paganism and against the introduction of its methods and ideas in the Slovak Republic, they did so with the spoken word; it was not their voca-

tion to be in revolt against their Republic. Even later in the re-created CSR they had reservations against many things but they never advocated violent opposition because it does not concur with their vocation. They could not join the uprising because at the beginning it was unclear, it was not known who was behind it and what goals it was following. The main leaders of the opposition did not know of its outbreak and it started with various political aims. Dr. Gustáv Husák wrote in his report of 5 February 1945 to the leadership of the CPCS: "The uprising did not break out at a favorable time for us, its start was forced upon us by the Germans and the partizans" (*Dokumenty*, 1965, [no. 576] p. 975). In the documentation, the following comment is added to the orders of the high command of the army of 31 August 1944 and signed by General [Rudolf] Viest: "Naturally Viest was not in [Banská] Bystrica . . . his name was signed at headquarters so the order would have greater weight" (*Dokumenty*, 1965, [no. 206] p. 381 [note 4]). The motives of the leading personalities and the average person were different. Some were saying that Slovakia had been attacked by German and Hungarian soldiers (*Dokumenty*, [nos 188, 189] pp. 363-364). One reads in the report of Dr. Husák: "Many soldiers announced that they would not fight for the CSR and many Communists and others demanded the annexation [of Slovakia] to the USSR . . . In London there was not a word about the Slovak nation" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 576] p. 951). General Viest spoke of the restoration of the CSR because: "the Czech worker and the Czech craftsman are known in the world for their industry . . . [and] capabilities whereas the Slovaks . . . are a little primitive . . . hardworking agricultural nation . . . the top intellectual stratum in Slovakia is more than thin . . . they have to send their sons to study abroad . . . However, the Slovak peasant has no great inclination for this . . ." For this reason General Viest opposed the Slovak State (*Dokumenty*, no. 587, pp. 1101-2). On the other hand, in Dr. Husák's report of 5 February 1945 to Moscow after the uprising we read: "The Slovak nation fought simultaneously against Hitler, Tiso and Beneš and secured the status of an independent nation on whose behalf no one else will ever be able to speak" (*Dokumenty*, [no. 576] p. 976). One reads in the report of 14 December 1944 about the situation during the uprising by Deputy V. Uhlíř upon his return from a trip as member

of a governmental delegation to the USSR and Slovakia: "The officer corps . . . was not homogeneous . . . it did not do any good that many officers tried to get to rear units and to army offices . . . The men did not have the appropriate training and there existed among them such helplessness and disunity about the ultimate aims of the struggle . . . one found the Czechoslovak, the Communist and the independent Slovak orientation" (*Dokumenty*, no. 563, p. 877).

The SNU (Slovak National Uprising) almost brought about a general opposition in Slovakia against the ideology and the inhuman ways of Nazism and it is in this way that it is known in the world. The authors of the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" were guilty of an irreparable error in showing the whole uprising to national and world opinion as an attack against the Church and today's faithful. It will be very difficult to repair this error. The faithful at home were horrified by it and the rest of the world will hardly be cheered up by this one-sidedness. The historical problems of Slovakia are also being studied in foreign institutions and according to the rigorous principles of scientific work. The television series put the SNU in the inappropriate sphere of atheistic propaganda and in this way damaged many things in Slovakia and abroad. It compels the faithful to defend themselves, to study situations and obstinately to seek the truth. It was pathetic how the series played with pictures and film cuttings, how it showed the shootings, dead bodies, burned homes and how it mixed all of this with film shots of churches, masses, crucifixes and bishops and the comments of the commentator: "see how far clerofascism under the priest president took things." The peak of tendentiousness was reached with the descriptions of the trials of the SUHG [Special Units of the Hlinka Guard]. Everything was pointed against the Church "against priests who educate murderers" and so forth. The unspoken claim which came out of all this is that "priests" were primarily responsible for nearly all of the murders during the period September-November 1944, that they were responsible for all the destruction and suffering because "they were bringing up murderers." The producers constantly illustrated this view and almost imposed it [upon viewers] with frequent pictures of altars and religious offices. In their tenden-

tiousness, the authors eliminated any sense of moderation and it will be very difficult for them to repair this error. Every lost life of those times was and remains an irreparable tragedy and every destroyed human habitation was also a tragedy. But to attribute this as a fault of churches, altars, bishops and the Church is not historical and unfair. One has to keep in mind that until August 1944 no one was executed in Slovakia and that no life was taken violently. Churches, crosses, masses and bishops had nothing in common with the military operations in whose midst Slovakia found herself suddenly after August 1944. Armed opposition to Hitler counted on battles and their consequences. The horrible logic of war applied to the uprising. In this imposed logic of war, the high command of the German Army immediately reacted as did the high command of the uprising as soon as the uprising broke out. According to the documentation, the sender "Za slovenskú slobodu" [For Slovak freedom] on 30 August 1944 was announcing: "Blowing up bridges, tunnels, destroy railways, telephone and telegraph lines, destroy factories and other strategic objects, kill Germans" (*Dejiny Slovenského národného povstania 1944*, Bratislava, 1984, p. 372). In an operational command, General Viest on 24 October 1944 decreed: "I warn most strongly that the destruction of communications must be done very thoroughly" (*Dokumenty*, no. 486, p. 754). In the comprehensive report of 1 December 1944 about the combat activities of the partizan units one reads: "Blown up: 24 railway bridges, 33 road bridges . . . 46 locomotives destroyed, 548 wagons, 1 tunnel . . . 273 cars and tractors, 2 railway yards, 5 mines, the locomotive depot and train station in Poltar, 2 electrical generators" (*Dokumenty*, no. 557, p. 759). Such was the inexorable logic of war. The television series aimed it all at the Church. The pictures of dead bodies and graves were particularly painful, alternating again and again with religious symbols, altars and crosses. The dead were, however, the horrible consequence of a horrible war which also reached Slovakia! If until August 1944 there were no violent deaths in Slovakia, then they appeared in great numbers on both sides. When I open [the book] *Dejiny*, I can read: "In the last two weeks of August, the partizans intensified their activities to such a degree that open partizan warfare broke out in Slovakia. The partizans attacked communication lines, depots of

materials, they liquidated the Hitlerites and their collaborators'' (*Slovensko, Dejiny*, Bratislava, 1971, p. 768 — hereafter *Dejiny*). Then one reads about actions in Turany, Skalica, Harmanec, Vrútky. According to the text: "The partizans liquidated a group of German field gendarmes . . . Near Strečno, they destroyed a German automobile convoy . . . In Brezno, they liquidated Slameň, Deputy for the HSPP, with a group of people . . . They captured in [Turčiansky Svätý] Martin a German military mission from an international rapid train . . . on the next day, during an attempt at resistance, they shot [the members of] the mission . . . Ludin announced that the development of partizan warfare in Slovakia did not allow the Germans to wait anymore, that it was inevitable to bring in the army' (*Dejiny*, p. 770). Those were wartime events and the series could have presented them as such — without masses, without crosses, without the presence of Slovak bishops.

Faced with the still powerful military machine of Hitler, even Slovak officials were almost completely powerless. The German Army did not tolerate opposition behind its lines and attacked. A quarter of a century later an historian wrote about this situation: "From a historical perspective, it is clear that Tiso did not bring the Germans into Slovakia, indeed the German forces would have invaded us and attacked the uprising in any event" (Ľ. Lipták, *Slovensko v 20. storočí*, Bratislava 1968, p. 248). The television series did not help the reputation of the SNU by surrounding it with pictures of statues, churches, altars and with the sounds of organs and in the name of aggressive atheism directing it almost exclusively against the Church and the faithful. This could only provoke exasperation among the faithful. And among historians and others, definite disagreement. It was a military affair and it should have been shown as such.

The battles were then merciless on both sides, people died from shots on both sides, graves appeared in Sklené and Nemecká Lupča, and later in other places. It was pitiful, however, when the series showed the unveiling of the face of a corpse with the comment: "this is how far the priest president went." If German soldiers in this warlike situation were indiscriminately hard, and they were, the soldiers of the uprising defended themselves also with toughness. The Church as such had no role in this. Anyone who

knows the situation from his own experience or knows about it from documents does not involve the Church in these actions and counter-actions. By then, the law of war was at work. On 8 December 1944, the high command of the partizan movement published Order no. 30 whose text reads as follows: "A merciless fight with the traitors among the population and the partizans, soldiers and officers who went to serve the German occupants — this is the most important task of the offensive actions of the units. Liquidate all of these enemies mercilessly and spread the news about this in all the areas from where they come" (*Dokumenty*, no. 338, p. 860). The idea of opposition to Nazism, like every great idea, was carried out by people. Among them, besides known personalities, there were average people, even very simple people. The latter created for the uprising many problems and worries. However painful it is, the misuse of the SNU by the television series against the Church requires the quoting of further passages from the very same Order no. 30: "In many villages, mountains and forests there is an important multitude of dispersed units and groups of partizans, soldiers and officers . . . The majority of them . . . are simply waiting . . . The others, who call themselves "partizans" terrorize the population". Similarly in the report of Deputy Uhlíř for London of 14 December 1944 we read: "The commander of the staff of Soviet partizans, Colonel [A.N.] Asmolov, described to us the situation in the partizan movement . . . from his partizan brigades, three are the best . . . Even among the partizans there were cases of unlawful actions, so that three partizans had to be publicly executed for murder and pillage . . . There were among the partizans such individuals who did not have anything in common with the partizan movement. The population was clearly afraid of some of these elements" (*Dokumenty*, no. 563, p. 890). The attempt to place the SNU in the service of an anti-religious struggle and against the Church, in the way done by the authors of the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power," is to serve badly the nation, and to evaluate wrongly proper sacrifices and personal heroism and will force historians and believers as well to study these questions thoroughly, directly from sources and not from the superficial propaganda of atheism.

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" tried finally to attack the Catholic Church in Slovakia with a description of the trials of the so-called Special Units of the HG [Hlinka Guard] which took place in Bratislava and Banská Bystrica in 1958 and in all of which a priest was also tried. The priest A.H. had been invited on Christmas Eve to a group in the HG and spoke to them about Christmas. Some of the accused claimed that "he had encouraged them to kill and that later in the confessional they easily obtained absolution with five Our Fathers." The priest denied this strongly before the court. The accused almost tried to outdo each other with their confessions. However, the fourth one directly accused them of "absolutely not speaking the truth." They had deprived far more people of their life; he had made a mistake. According to the series, many accused spoke before the court primarily of priests. In fact, one of them with raised voice and gestures said: "My mother did not bring me up as a murderer, the priests did!" This was meant to be proof of how priests and the Church were against the uprising and how they preached murder. This reminds one of the trials from the early fifties when the accused almost raced to confess. It seemed from the testimony that the Church had honored the uprising. This was in 1958, when Dr. Husák, one of the leaders of the uprising, was still in jail while other leaders, L. Novomeský and D. Okáli, had returned from jail shortly before. Other leaders of the uprising like R. Slánsky, Major [Viliam] Žingor and companions, [Jozef] Trojan and companions had been condemned to death six years earlier and General L. Svoboda, the main leader in the liberation struggle, who had been until 1948 Minister of National Defence, had lost his rank and worked during the years 1952-55 as an accountant on a collective farm. After 1960, when in jail in Valdice, I met many of those condemned in the trials of the SUHG, including the two priests, the situation became clear. The condemned indicated that as a result of entreaties and threats they had signed confessions and had repeated them before the court. When this did not alleviate matters for them, and they were still given severe sentences, some recanted their confessions before the Supreme Court, but, by then, no one was listening to them. In jail, many of them apologized to the two priests who had been falsely condemned and jailed.

After the pictures of the courtroom of the trials of the SUHG, there were pictures of shootings, corpses and graves, pictures of a little church on a mountain top, then sculptures of a church interior and a cross which the producers had presented with the head upside down. Following all of this was the crudest blasphemy of the series: there was no face or body, but a hand holding in two fingers a host and a voice declaring pathetically: "This is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world." It is in this way that murders were connected with holy masses, the most holy of mysteries for Christians. It is at this point that the seventeen year-old student exclaimed: "Satanic Verses the Slovak way . . ." Although the series was entitled "a documentary", this was clearly not a document, but theatre. The hand held a *small* host whereas a priest holds a big one. Besides in 1958, no priest celebrated mass in Slovak but in Latin, [saying] "Ecce Agnus Dei . . ." Long after 1963, after the [Vatican] Council, Slovak was used in the liturgy. The scene was therefore filmed as theatre for the purpose of ridicule. . .

As far as Church circles are concerned, including the President, there is historical evidence that they were not on the side of Hitler and against the Slovak people in the uprising; rather, they tried to help the unfortunate wherever they could. Before the National Tribunal in Bratislava on 6 January 1947 Dr. [Igor] Daxner said to Archbishop Kmet'ko: "you said something about a certain German general who was also accompanied by Tiso. This German general demanded that a pastoral letter against Communism be published." Dr. Kmet'ko replied: "Yes, Tiso did indeed come with this German general and I found it very surprising that when the general made the request, Tiso sat beside him and did not say a word, he simply kept quiet" (*Katolícke noviny*, spring 1947).

The attitude of the President toward the partizans was also made clear before the National Tribunal in additional testimony as published in the daily *Sloboda*. The President of the court, Dr. Daxner, asked the witness, Dr. K. Murín, personal secretary of the President: "Were you in Banská Bystrica with the President after the uprising?" Dr. Murín replied: "I was." Dr. Daxner asked: "Did Dr. Tiso free the partizans or did he intervene on their behalf?" Dr. Murín replied: "when we were on our way to the archbishop's

palace, at that moment a column of our own arrested soldiers marched by. Dr. Tiso went among them, spoke with them and told them that he would do everything for them that was within his power. The Germans were shocked that he was speaking with partisans. In the evening, Dr. Tiso, Dr. Ján Ďurčanský and a German superior officer were together and there I heard with my own ears Dr. Tiso, in the presence of Dr. Ďurčanský, ask the German officer to send these boys back to Slovakia and to set them free. The Germans agreed and Ďurčanský was to negotiate with them" (*Sloboda*, 28 January 1947).

There are historical documents which show that upon the request of the President, the Germans began to send some deported Slovaks back from the Reich. In fact, at the beginning of December 1944 Tiso wrote a personal letter to Hitler and complained that German officials were not respecting the financial agreements concluded and were using public and private Slovak property to such an extent "that is not acceptable for my nation and intolerable for me and my government." Himmler reacted to this letter: "... effrontery. There is no other word for it..." (*Slovenské národné povstanie. Nemci a Slovensko 1944. Dokumenty*, Bratislava 1970, p. 619, doc. 223, p. 450, doc. 233, pp. 474-5)

Z. Fierlinger reported in a dispatch to London dated 25 November 1944: "The Bratislava government will forgive all soldiers from the former Slovak army who return" ... (*Slovenské Národné Povstanie. Dokumenty*, Bratislava 1965, [no. 552] p. 849). And in his report to London, Dr. J. Kopecký was reporting as early as 25 September 1944 from Geneva: "The Germans disarmed everywhere where the Slovak army was garrisoned except the units in barracks in the centre of town in Nitra and Trenčín. Everywhere the Gestapo began immediately arresting and deporting Jews who were still free. Tiso was the first to intervene on their behalf and received assurances that although they would be brought together, they would not be taken from the territory of Slovakia. The Jews from Nitra were ... taken in the direction of the city of Sered'. Archbishop Kmeťko tried to intervene with the commander of the German garrison who told him that he could do nothing against the Gestapo. Kmeťko went to the Gestapo who told him that they were carrying out orders and that nothing could be changed. The

Jewish Central Agency continues to be active in Bratislava'' (*Dokumenty*, 1965, [no. 578] p. 578).

The possibilities of those who wanted to come to the help of our people, of soldiers, of partizans and of Jewish citizens in these terrible weeks were accordingly very limited. Still there was certainly an attempt also on the part of the Church to help. Yet the hardness on one side and the impotence to help on the other were at times far too great. And thus it happened that during the uprising, Nazi officials in Ružomberok took from the Jesuits, about whom it was later written that they had in those times a great deal of influence, the convert Tomáš Munka directly from the novitiate, who after his secondary studies had entered the Society of Jesus, and sent him, together with his parents and younger brother, to Germany where they all perished.

The television series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" simplified historical facts and distorted many of them. It saw the SNU only within the context of its own struggle against the Church and the faithful, thus placing it in a false light, and as a result badly served our mutual coexistence in the present and in the future. According to the series, everything in the Slovak State was evil, everything was criminal and the fault was the Church's. This is an untrue simplification. Serious participants in the opposition and in the struggle saw the situation otherwise at that time. In the report of the V illegal leadership of the CPS dated 7 July 1944, "About the developments in Slovakia after 6 October 1838," which K. Šmidke took to Moscow, the following was written about the situation in the Slovak State: "Emigration, in particular that in London, is either badly informed about the situation or else is deliberately misinterpreting facts. The fact is that this state has independence and it has the kind of independence that is possible for a small nation and in time of war . . . Internal affairs are handled only by the regime itself. The economy is taken care of by the [Slovak] people. Legislation, schools and so forth are in the hands of the [Slovak] people. German influence is great, but not so great for independence to be a stupid mask. For example, in less than five years, the Gestapo did not arrest even one Slovak citizen. Viliam Široký, who was taken from prison in Bratislava to Brno for cross-examination, was sent back although the Germans wanted badly

to get rid of him there. German pressure, which is to be found at the level of inter-state relations, whether political or economic, does not touch the average citizen on the street, in public life. Hitler is still respecting [Slovak] independence and in the course of the past year, the Germans from the Reich have behaved especially politely. If this state were of another orientation and governed by another regime, not to say anything about a change of ally, then from the Slovak point of view there would be nothing to say against it. It comes therefore as no surprise that honest-thinking people here in Slovakia entertain the idea of retaining the state after the existing regime is replaced and the state is given a new social content. We say this for the sake of a complete report. London, which attacks the state and its independence, thinking that in this way it is attacking the regime, is in fact missing its target. The kind of state certain people wish to live in is a matter of one's strong opinion and of the wish of the people; however, the form of the state, the land and the language — and the political regime are two different things. This relative independence Slovakia enjoys has today an overwhelming importance for all levels of the liberation struggle, for the preparations and the leadership of the struggle. This is true not only for Slovakia, but also for the Czech Lands, as will be seen when it will be possible to speak openly about certain matters. It is not reasonable to underestimate (as London does) the desire of statehood of a small nation even if it is obtained through a politically stupid regime and at a time when other nations are losing their independence. It insults national pride." (*Dejiny Slovenského národného povstania 1944. Dokumenty*, Vol. 3, Bratislava 1984, doc. 228, pp. 340-341).

There is another historical document about the conversation Lutheran Bishop Fedor Ruppeldt had with a British diplomat. It is found in the diplomatic dispatch of British Consul J.A. Grant, dated 18 June 1947, numbered 25. 5.1/7-44 and addressed to the British Foreign Secretary. The conversation took place two months after the execution of Dr. J. Tiso. The essential passage goes as follows: "Sir, I had a talk with the Lutheran Bishop Ruppeldt yesterday . . . As you know Ruppeldt is a man of strong Slovak feeling and emphatic opinions; but he is well informed and has no small influence and I think you may like to know what he told me. He

considers the execution of Tiso as a political blunder of the first order . . . The execution has strengthened the barriers between [. . .] Slovaks and Czechs . . . Bishop Ruppeldt said that he tried for two hours to explain this to Dr. Beneš before the execution, and that his colleague of Liptovský Mikuláš had made a similar effort . . . He said that Tiso's defence was similar to that of Marshal Pétain's, and with good grounds. The Slovak people were undoubtedly saved by the establishment of the Slovak State from partition between Germany, Hungary and Poland; and until the Rising Slovakia, puppet state or not, was indeed an oasis of rest and plenty in a troubled Europe. Tiso had been blamed for not associating himself with the Rising: but if he had the Germans would assuredly have laid waste the country, massacred the people and destroyed Slovakia . . . Tiso's political course still kept Slovakia intact . . . The Bishop also pointed out that under Tiso's regime, not a single sentence of capital punishment was carried out. I report these opinions for what they may be worth. Ruppeldt has been described to me as the "Niemöller of Slovakia" and was himself, a you know, imprisoned under the Slovak State. His views might easily be so much harsher that I am inclined to listen to what he says . . . "

[Michael] Cardinal [von] Faulhaber, one of the greatest opponents of Nazism in Germany, in a letter dated 2 November 1951 wrote that even if Dr. Tiso had been in Hitler's sphere of influence and in contact with him out of political and contemporary necessity, "he kept his independence in his discussions with Hitler and never lowered himself to be Hitler's lackey".

The series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" took the account beyond 1948, in fact until 1958. In the subsequent discussion, four of its participants (O. Dányi, J. Čelko, J. Síleš and L. Dupkala) spoke of the present — of Catholic Action, of the illegal structures of the Church in Slovakia in which they say "clero-fascism" is still surviving. Many practicing believers had already been described as "the posthumous children of clero-fascism" by these same authors. This expression is strange. I was fifteen years old when the Slovak State was proclaimed. Today's believers who are fifty were hardly ten weeks old on 14 March 1939. And tens of thousands of young believers can hardly be posthumous children when they hardly

know anything about those past events. The series was evidently interested only in one thing — today's Church in Slovakia and the awakening of faith in the Church among the young generation. This took the authors down a blind alley where, in many instances, they confused history with fantasy. The aim was clear — to create pressure on today's believers, to drive into them the idea that the Church was the source of all evil in Slovakia — and that, for this reason, the faithful should keep quiet. According to the series, Pope Pius XII supported Fascism in Slovakia by elevating Dr. Kmet'ko to the rank of archbishop. The faithful have thought and think otherwise: "We did not have a Slovak archbishop for centuries because someone did not wish us to have one and we do not have one even today, but Pius XII gave us one then." Elsewhere, according to the series, "the crowning achievement of all reactionary activities" was realized by the Vatican in 1949 when it supposedly excommunicated "all those who supported the government of the people's democracy." In actual fact, in 1949 the Vatican excommunicated the members of the so-called schismatic Catholic Action, a political movement that fell apart shortly thereafter. And it excommunicated those believers who joined atheistic organizations. Later, these very organizations forbade their members from belonging to the Church and from taking part in religious offices. This is how matters were settled.

The series "The Cross in the Snares of Power" wanted to explain events that took place fifty years ago. It explained them badly, in the same way as those events that are taking place right before our eyes are often explained. It called Slovak Catholics "clero-fascists" and indicated that this was the reason why the Church lost her seminaries, schools, journals and religious orders and even the Greek Catholics. In the Czech Lands, however, there were no "clero-fascists" and the Church also lost everything. Bishops Trochta and Zéla went from German concentration camps into new jails together with the Slovak Bishops Vojtaššák, Gojdič, Hopko, Buzalka and Barnáš. The then Czech Bishops Hlouch and Skoupý and Archbishop Beran were interned for a number of years or else confined together with the Slovak Bishops Dr. Pobožný, Nécsey and Lazík. This evidently did not concern clero-fascism. This concerned atheism and the question of justice and freedom. Such an

honest man and writer as Václav Havel and his friends did not have anything to do with "clero-fascism" and yet they still ended up twice in jail. Some people put [in the same group of enemies of socialism, Catholics, other Christians, non-Christians and defenders of socialism.]

In the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power," six to seven people insulted in six programs of thirty minutes each hundreds of thousands of believers in Slovakia. According to the authors of the discussion, half of the population of Slovakia is Catholic. Even this would be enough to ask the serious question whether it makes sense to insult half the population for three hours on state television. According to the statistics of the journal *Ateizmus* (5/88) which is published by the authors of the series, there is *above average* religiosity in 11 districts in Slovakia. It is *definitely above average* in a further 14 districts — baptisms account for 78%, Church marriages for 58% and Church funerals for 85%. *Very above average* religiosity is found in a further 12 districts — they have 86% baptisms, 84% Church marriages, 92% Church funerals. Accordingly, the authors of the series insulted more than 50% of the population of Slovakia who produce conscientiously bread, meat, milk, vegetable and fruits for the villages, and again clothing and footwear in the cities and build us apartments.

The Church has been in Slovakia for 1100 years and survived many a historical catastrophe. May God allow that she will live another thousand years. It is a pity that such a struggle against her and the faithful is connected with the name of the CSSR. To-day in the world, the idea of the cooperation of all peoples in the spirit of toleration, the idea of mutual faith and a common home is gaining ground. Even in Slovakia and in the CSSR there is a need for cooperation among all inhabitants — Catholics with Lutherans, Christians with non-Christians, Slovaks with Czechs, all together with our neighbours. In this country, and especially in Slovakia, Catholics and the Church were oppressed again and again for many years. Some dioceses in Slovakia, in the Czech Lands and in Moravia were without a bishop for 30 years, some for 38 years, something which has no analogy in history and nowhere else in the world today. In the Czech Lands, Charter 77 and the CDUP [Committee for the Defence of the Unjustly Persecuted] have in

the past few years openly defended the Catholic Church and the faithful for which they have earned sincere thanks. In 1988, the faithful of other Christian Churches in the Czech Lands defended Catholics and the Catholic Church in this Republic in letters to the government, for which they have also earned sincere thanks. Catholics and the Catholic Church were also defended by socialist thinkers whom the faithful also thank sincerely. A solidarity was born which augurs well for the future. All those who opposed Slovak Catholicism rendered and continue to render a bad service to the nation and the Republic. They undermine their own common home as their predecessors had already done. They attack the Church and the believers, while, after many years, believers who are theoretically equal to non-believers do not have the opportunity to answer and to defend themselves.

K.M. Kharchev, Director of the Office for Church Affairs in the USSR, has written that many prejudices have to be shed in the effort to obtain true freedom of conscience for all citizens. According to him, "this touches positively the feelings of believers and atheists" (*Ľýždenník aktualit* 11/88, pp. 4-8). The faithful in Slovakia read such words only with quiet envy. Or is it with hope?

In the past forty years, we have had many affirmations and opinions which we later retracted, many condemnations which we had to overturn with rehabilitations. We had many so-called "important people" whose glory died and who today are not remembered. The members of the Institute for Scientific Atheism over the years presented us believers as suspicious citizens. And this still goes on. A recent example is the series "The Cross in the Snares of Power." However, the faithful still live here, and more and more young people who are looking for the truth are joining the Church. On top of all the words and pictures in the series, which were glued together without any regard for the truth, for true history and for the future of the nation, I want to quote the words of the poet: "Who will save my soul from the avalanche of people's words? From afar they seem like a xylophone, from close they are only tin bells. They are like wild waters, which produce only their howling noise. Today they are the cradle of truth, tomorrow its grave. They reach us with their hands — only God can seize our soul. They fill us with wine changed into vinegar, but the soul requires truth and eternity . . .

It is becoming clearer to me that everything human built without love is exposed to destruction. Where a garden blooms today, tomorrow it is a wilderness. And where people work in the morning, destruction thunders at night. . . ."

With these thoughts, I became even more deeply aware what the *Church*, which educated us for a thousand years, means for the faithful. It has prayers which hear the fields and the forests. It knows how to bless water and bread. And while my generation will disappear like sand into nothingness, the Church towers like a peak into eternity. She embraces nations and continents and her breath blows through all generations. The measure of her faithfulness is not human faithfulness and the measures of her years known no autumn. Everything that she does not change is put aside by death . . . she forgives even enemies, she is willing to serve them and to heal wounds. The Church is the way of all of our ways and along these roads, people have been walking to God for thousands of years. This is why I live in her, this is why I defend her and this is why I wrote this long letter.

Respectfully,

J. Ch. Korec,
Bratislava, 7 April 1989

Translated from the Slovak by Stanislav J. Kirschbaum

REVIEW ESSAY

REVIEW ESSAY

Ján Kačala, Mária Pisárčiková *et al.*, *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*. Bratislava: Veda, 1987. 587 pp.

Ján Šimko
West Virginia University,
Parkersburg, W.Va.

I

The purpose of this review essay is to assess some aspects of the vocabulary of present-day Slovak on the basis of the material included in this most recent dictionary. In order to present it in proper perspective, it is necessary to see the dictionary as part of the historical stream of Slovak dictionary making.

The 'father' of Slovak lexicography was the Reverend Anton Bernolák (1762-1813). Towards the end of the eighteenth century he made a valiant, though unsuccessful effort to elevate the western Slovak dialect into the first official Slovak literary standard. Bernolák compiled a noteworthy lexicographical work, the *Slowár Slowenský Česko-Laťínsko-Ňemecko-Uherský seu Lexicon Slavicum Bohemico-Latino-Germanico-Ungaricum*. It is considered a signal pioneer achievement for one person working singlehandedly in those days. Bernolák had started his ambitious project as early as 1787 and completed it twenty-one years later. Printed in Budapest, the capital of Hungary of which Slovakia formed a part, the six-volume dictionary appeared only posthumously between 1825 and 1827. Significantly, this was one year before the publication of Noah Webster's (1758-1843) classic, *An American Dictionary of the English Language*.

It took about a hundred years for a more modern Slovak dictionary to appear. It was the *Slovenský slovník z literatúry aj nářečí* (1924-25) containing around 40,000 entries compiled by Karel Kálal (1886-1930) and Miroslav Kálal (1893-1962). A noteworthy dictionary of the thirties was the *Slovenský frazeologický slovník* (Praha — Prešov: Československá grafická únia, first edition 1931, second ed. 1933, supplement 1937) produced by Peter Tvrďý (1850-1935).¹ It was under the auspices of the leading Slovak cultural institution, the

Matica slovenská of Turčiansky Svätý Martin, that Anton Jánošík (1904-71) and Eugen Jóna (b. 1909) had set out to work on a larger dictionary, the *Slovník spisovného jazyka slovenského* (1946-49), which, however, remained uncompleted.

The extensive Matica material of around half a million cards was taken over by the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, which has published the first comprehensive dictionary to date, the *Slovník slovenského jazyka* (1959-68), with Štefan Peciar (1912-1988) as its editor. In the 79,784 entries of its five volumes, the SSJ treats 125,302 words covering a period of around 150 years. The material of the rather slim supplementary sixth volume has not been tabulated.

Since 1931 urgent needs of Slovak users have been met by the orthographical-grammatical manual, the *Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu* (eleventh edition 1971). It is a chronicle of the moving and often also turbulent history of Slovak in modern times. Not unlike a bus, railroad or airline schedule, this book regulates the current usage of Slovak and, with official sanction to back it up, it has enjoyed something of the authority and power of the law.

Since, due to their long production periods, dictionaries tend to lag behind the fast pace of vocabulary development and language change, the need began to be felt to bring the SSJ up to date. The result, more accessible to the general public than the six-volume SSJ, is the recent one-volume KSSJ under discussion. On its 555 pages, it treats around 50,000 words including derivations, covering a period of about one-hundred years.

II

1. The *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka* (KSSJ) is organized as follows:

(a) Entries are printed in **boldface** type. Incorrect or unacceptable words are, as a rule, but not always, printed in regular type usually followed by a rising arrow (↑) referring to the correct word form(s) appearing, most of the time, in **boldface** type, for instance: crawl ↑ **kraul**, and it is under this latter heading that the word is found treated. Let us survey the other possibilities:

dopis (letter), správ. (= správne; correctly) **list** (see point 3e below);

kartáč (brush), správ. **kefa**;
 prádlo (laundry), správ. **bielizeň** (see point 3e below);
 zavazadlo (luggage), správ. **batožina** (see point 3e below);
 vyporiadať sa (to settle), nespis. (= nespisovne; non-standard)
vyrovnať sa.

It is under the latter words printed in **boldface** that these cases are treated in KSSJ. In other instances, it is, nonetheless, under the main entry printed in **boldface** type, although not considered quite acceptable, that the words are treated:

blbý (stupid), subšt. (= subštandardný) sprostý, hlúpy;
chovať sa (to behave), vhodnejšie (more suitable) správať sa.
 The following, although synonyms, are handled differently:
závada (defect), vhodnejšie chyba²; but:
vada (defect) 1. správ. **chyba** . . .

In this latter case, each word is, surprisingly, printed in **boldface** type but, unlike the similar cases above (dopis etc.), the treatment is nevertheless given under the 'incorrect' main entry!

In some cases, the word considered 'incorrect' may appear 'correct' in another form. In the following case, the derived adjective is considered 'incorrect,' while the root word is considered 'correct':
 dielčí (partial), správ. **čiastkový**; but the root word is acceptable:

diel (part), časť, čiastka. Similarly:

tryskové lietadlo (jet aircraft), správ. *prúdové lietadlo*, although the word base **tryska** (jet) is correct or acceptable.

Other similar cases:

obťaž (difficulty), správ. **ťažkosť**; but the verb **obťažovať** (to trouble) is acceptable;

odstavec (paragraph), správ. **odsek**; but **odstaviť** (to set off, to separate) is acceptable;

zahájiť (to start, to open), správ. **otvoriť**, **začať**; but **hájiť** (to defend) is acceptable: in this case, the word base (the 'correct' **hájiť**) and the derived form (the 'incorrect' zahájiť) do not share the same basic meaning.

In another case, again, the 'correct' form appears only in one use but not in others:

kl'ud (quiet), správ. **pokoj**; the latter is no longer listed in the sense of 'room' = izba or its derivative *pokojská (chamber

maid) = **chyžná**, the two expunged forms current previously but considered of Czech provenance.

Finally, some words — marked with an asterisk here (*) — , previously current but not listed any more in KSSJ, do appear in other forms:

- **brusle* (a pair of skates; now **korčule**) but **brúsiť** (to sharpen);
- **savec* (mammal; now **cicavec**) but **sať** (to suck) does exist, although **cicať** is considered 'more suitable' (*vhodnejšie*);
- **uprchlík* (fugitive; now **utečenec**) but **prchať** . . . 2. *expr.* (= *expresívne*; to flee) is included. For more instances, see point 3e below.

Some phraseology is also suggested for correction. Under **doba**, there is a phrase:

pracovná d. (working time) *vhodnejšie* (more suitable) *prac.* (= *pracovný*) čas.

Each correct entry has an abbreviated small-type index attached to it characterizing it as to its respective part of speech. In addition to that, nouns are also marked as to gender and verbs as to whether they are perfective or imperfective, and both nouns and verbs have some basic inflectional forms given. Many nouns of foreign origin have no declension in Slovak, for instance:

lady [lejd-] *neskl. ž (angl.)* (= *nesklonné ženské anglické*; not declined, feminine, English).

The typography used in KSSJ is not always consistent. In one case, the characteristic is properly in small type:

bubeník (drummer) . . . 2. *v min.* (= *v minulosti*; in the past).

In another case, the same characteristic is printed in normal type:

notár (notary) . . . 2. *v min.* For other examples see 3b: **polícia**, **žandár**.

A very helpful item is the indication of the pronunciation of doubtful or difficult cases placed in square brackets following the main entry. Let us stop at the interesting word **dekan** (dean). Being of Latin origin, it was first pronounced with the initial hard [d], which was later 'Slovakized' and softened or palatalized to [d'] but now returned to [d] again.

In the case of a word having more individual meanings than one, they are numbered with **boldface** figures: 1. . . . 2. . . . etc.

and often illustrated with examples of usage printed in *italics*. Thus, for instance, under **do**ba there is a phrase: *pracovná d.* (working time) *vhodnejšie* (more suitable) *prac.* (= *pracovný*) čas. Sometimes the division of meanings raises questions, for instance:

opera 1. dielo (work); budova (building) . . . : why are these totally distinct and separate meanings grouped together, and not under their own numbers, 1., 2.?

In the case of a word form belonging to more than one part of speech, each is marked, within the same entry, with **boldface** Roman numerals:

dobre (well) **I.** *prís*l. (= *príslovka*; adverb) . . . **II.** *čas*t. (= *čas*tica; particle).

If the respective separate meanings of a word belong to /a/ totally different semantic areas or to /b/ marked stylistic spheres, use is made of *small-type* characteristics, for instance:

/a/ **dek**linácia *ž* (= *ženský*; feminine) 1. *ling*v. (= *lingvistický*) skloňovanie (declension) 2. *fyz*. (= *fyzikálny*) . . .

/b/ **dial'** *ž* poet. (= *poetický*) dial'ka (distance).

For unknown reasons, there are inconsistencies in the handling of words with more meanings, if one is animate and the other inanimate. In one example, the two meanings are numbered individually under one headword:

trampka 1. (woman hiker = animate) 2. (canvas shoes = inanimate).

Another case parallel to this one is, however, handled differently, although also under one heading. The headword introduces the animate meaning, while the same word is printed later within the nest, introducing the inanimate meaning:

tramp živ. (= *životný*; animate) . . . **tramp** neživ. (= *neživotný*; inanimate) tramping;

nepodarok živ. (misfit) . . . **nepod**arok neživ. (lemon, faulty product; see point 3b);

štartér (anim. = a person giving a sign to start) . . . **š**tartér (inanim. = a thing that starts)!

Are there any basic differences as to the respective semantic structures of these words, except a difference of gender: **tramp**ka feminine, **tramp** etc. masculine and, with **š**tartér, of English origin?

There are many similar cases in KSSJ, for instance:

žehlič živ. (=životný; animate = he who irons) . . . **žehlič**
neživ. (=neživotný; inanimate = iron); but:
žehlička 1. (woman ironing) . . . 2. (iron).

A small square □ used with verbs is followed by the habitual phraseological combinations. A full, large dot ● is followed by idiomatic expressions.

(b) Not every word appears as an independent entry: words derived from a basic root are, as a rule but not always, grouped in a nest under one main entry and mostly indicated by a suffix, both headword and suffix appearing in **boldface** type:

hokej . . . ; --**ový**.

Less often, the derived word appears in a full word form:

/a/ in the same nest: **atletika** . . . **atlét** . . . **atletický**;

/b/ as an independent entry, irrespective of whether placed immediately after the root word:

/i/ **hokej** . . .

hokejista . . .

hokejka;

or alphabetically separated from the root word by several entries:

/ii/ **skóre** . . .

(5 other entries)

skórovať, etc.

In another possible case, again, a derived word form, alphabetically separated from its headword, is yet treated under the latter. In this instance, an arrow rising to the right points to the main entry word under which to find the derived form treated, for instance:

dubček (little oak) ↑ dub.³

Although in most cases the semantic structure of a derived word form is close to that of the word base, it is not always clear why a derived word immediately following its word base is listed not simply by means of the derivational suffix within one nest but as a separate entry, for instance:

hladič (man ironing)

hladička 1. (woman ironing); 2. (iron), and not simply: **hladič**
 . . . ; --**ka** . . . (See above for **žehlič**, **žehlička**.)

In an exaggerated effort to justify KSSJ's title *Krátky* (short), the suffixes listed in a nest appear not infrequently too short, creating uncertainty or even confusion as to what they stand for, for instance:

basketbal . . . ; --ista . . . ; --ka.

Does this mean that the suffix **--ka** is simply attached to the headword so as to give *basketbalka? Not at all, for there is no such word in Slovak, at present at least. In reality, the suffix **--ka** is the feminine variant of the masculine ending in the suffix **--ista**, so that the actual word has the correct form: **basketbalistka**. If, instead of the bare **--ka**, KSSJ had printed at least **--tka**, the 'mystery' as to the correct derivational form would be easier to solve, indicating that it is the feminine variant of the preceding **--ista**.

KSSJ is teeming with instances of this kind, confusing an uninitiated or foreign user made uncertain as to how the skeleton suffix should be correctly attached to the headword. No wonder or surprisingly, Klára Buzássyová, although an employee of the Linguistics Institute of the Slovak Academy that produced the dictionary, dared to voice her criticism that KSSJ "thus subjects its non-linguistic user to rather great demands."⁴

Let us consider a few striking cases:

film, --ový, --o: does this give, on the analogy of **filmový**, also a *filmo? Again, not at all. Since the latter form does not exist, why not make it perfectly clear that the suffix is **--ovo**? Similarly:

komfort, --ný, --e, --osť.

Should this sequence give: **komfortný**, *komforte, *komfortost'? Again: not at all! Since the forms marked with the asterisk (*) do not exist in present-day Slovak, why not help the user by a very tiny device indeed of adding a mere -n- that would not take up too much additional space at all but would mean quite a difference by indicating that **--ne, --nosť** stand for the correct forms: **komfortne, komfortnosť**.

Again, so very little is needed to produce a great difference in the case of **štandardizácia, --ačný**: should the suffix contain only one more letter: **--začný**, there would be no doubt whatsoever that the correct derivation is not a *štandardačný or the like but **štandardizačný**.

As to the independent entry **štandardný** -- itself derived from the earlier entry **štandard** -- : do the suffixes listed in the nest: **--e**, **--ost'**, stand for: *štandarde, *štandardost'? Absolutely not at all: these forms do not exist. And once again, a very short extension by one more letter, a mere -n-, requiring very little additional space indeed, would make a substantial difference, benefiting correct usage: **--ne**, **--nosť** give the correct **štandardne**, **štandardnosť**.

Our choice of these examples of English origin listed in KSSJ has been made with the purpose of facilitating proper understanding by our readers. In this connection, many more examples of this confusing kind could be quoted from the purely Slovak word stock.

This brings us finally to the most nonsensical cases of them all: **pólo**, **--ový**; **plexisklo**, **--ový**: does the attachment of the suffixes result in:

*póloový? *plexiskloový? Let us have a hearty laugh: where they really could have saved space, they did not; they needed more!

2. Abbreviated Verbal Endings.

A complication or confusion similar to the one just discussed is created in the following cases. There are a number of pairs of verbs starting with the respective prefixes: **za--**, **zo--**, **zm--**, **zn--**, **s--**. A pair consists of one — transitive — verb ending in **--it'** and the other — intransitive — ending in **--iet'**. Since the application of the proper form of the ending vowel may cause difficulty, our concern here is with the abbreviated form of the ending as suggested in the text of the KSSJ, the handling of which is not always helpful but rather, as we have seen in several previous instances, confusing and not uniform at all.

KSSJ is very helpful in indicating the past tense of some verbs: **znecitlivieť**, **znehýbnieť**, **znervóznieť** (to become insensitive, immobile, nervous) as **z--el** each. Why then is the past tense not only of **zmocnieť**, **znárodnieť**, **zovšeobecnieť** but also that of **zoštíhliť** (to become stronger, popular, generally known; to make slim) indicated in KSSJ as just **z--l**, although in reality the past tense of the first three — intransitive — verbs ends in **--el**, while that of the fourth — transitive — verb ends in **--il**?

Similarly, the past tense of **znevidieť** **sa** (to dislike) is indicated

as **z--lo**; should this represent a form *znevidielo? Not at all: there is no such form in Slovak. Then why not make it easy for the user by indicating the past tense ending as **--elo**, that is: **znevidelo**?

Why is it not made perfectly clear that the abbreviated past tense forms of **zosilnieť** (to get stronger) as indicated in KSSJ: **z--l**, **z--la** stand for **z--el**, **z--ela**, and not *zosilniel, --a, while **zosilniť** (to make stronger), with the same skeleton past tense as above: **z--l**, stands for **z--il**?

There does not seem to be any system or consistency of approach in the following cases. While, on the one hand, the past tense of **zotmieť sa**, **zotmiť sa** (to get dark) is properly distinguished as, respectively, **z--elo sa**, **z--ilo sa**, and that of the synonymous **stmieť sa**, **stmiť sa** as, respectively, **s--elo sa**, **s--ilo sa**, in the case of the parallel forms: **zatmieť sa**, **zatmiť sa** (to get dark), on the other hand, the past tense is only indicated by the extreme shorthand form **z--lo sa**. Does this give a form *zatmielo sa? Not at all: there is no such form in Slovak. An uninitiated user is left 'dangling in the wind,' wondering and at a loss as to what form of the vowel, [i] or [e], to insert in the skeleton past tense offered in KSSJ **z--lo sa**, which should be **z--elo sa**; **z--ilo sa**, impersonal.

Why all these shortcuts, shortcomings, gaps, defects, you may ask? Let Hamlet answer your impatient question:

Thrift, thrift, Horatio! (I.2)

Or shall we rather tap Polonius's perspicacity and worldly wisdom in adducing his famous aside:

Though this be madness, yet there is method it't (II.2).

Is there?

3. The Word Stock of Present-Day Slovak.

(a) Vocabulary Growth.

The vocabulary of a language is, in a sense, a living organism. During the existence of a language there is growth as well as decay in it going on all the time. This idea was emphasized by Dr. Samuel Johnson (1709-84), the 'father' of English lexicography, in his Preface to **A Dictionary of the English Language** (1755). It came in answer to those people who asked him to 'fix' the English language once and for all. He was fully aware, however, that this was impossible to do because of the ever-changing nature of language. And vocabulary is its most dynamic area.

New lexical units are created from the existing material or are admitted from other languages. Other lexical units which are losing their effectiveness or usefulness are replaced or discarded. This is to satisfy the ever-changing needs of the speech community faced with the task of naming new phenomena arising in the course of developments in the socio-political and economic spheres affecting the progress of daily life. The word stock is exceptionally sensitive to all these events which it promptly records.

Existing words may, again, extend their scope by adopting new meanings or may be limited in their range by discarding other meanings, and their stylistic status may be reevaluated. This latter phenomenon has been initiated or stimulated more recently as a result of the effort called the 'democratization of language.' In this process, some substandard non-literary 'four-letter' or vulgar or gross expressions, by being admitted into respectful dictionaries of the standard language, have been granted a certain degree of social acceptability, as will be discussed in point 8.

The spectacular growth of English can be documented by figures adduced from the impressive expansion of **The Random House Dictionary of the English Language**. Compared to its first edition of 1966, the second edition published in 1987 (the same year as the first edition of KSSJ) contains in its 315,000 entries 50,000 new items and 75,000 new definitions. This increase in the vocabulary of English, which covers a rather short span of only twenty-one years, is roughly equivalent to the abbreviated word stock of Slovak contained in the KSSJ! And this latter is supposed to cover a period of about one hundred years. Needless to say, Slovak is not likely to see any such massive vocabulary growth within an equal length of time.

KSSJ contains around 50,000 entries that include most of the derived word forms grouped in nests under one main heading, as discussed in point 1a above. In comparison, the five-volume academic **Slovník slovenského jazyka** (SSJ, 1959-65) treats 125,302 words under 79,784 entries, with additions included in the supplementary sixth volume (1968). It must be considered quite an achievement for a one-volume dictionary, the KSSJ, to cram onto its 555 three-column pages around one third of the material that is treated in the two-column SSJ of six volumes. SSJ contains, of

course, much more illustrative material gathered from a period of about 150 years, roughly since the establishment of the present literary standard in 1843, while the main concern of KSSJ is to cover the more recent usage of around 100 years.

A careful perusal of KSSJ's word list from A to Ž has yielded a very instructive picture of the current state of the Slovak lexicon. Its evaluation offers an idea of the trends and tendencies that have brought it about. The following movements within the word stock of Slovak have been observed.

(b) 'Rehabilitated' and Some Missing Words in KSSJ.

Many words that around fifty years ago fell out of favor in the process of 'Slovakizing Slovak' seem to have been reinstated or 'rehabilitated' — this term being deemed appropriate for the purpose of adequately characterizing certain events or processes taking place, from time to time, in the public life of that geographical area. The **boldface** type in which these words are printed in KSSJ indicates their present acceptability, although several of them are labeled *archaic*, *bookish* (*knižné*), *obsolescent* (*zastarávajúce*), *obsolete* (*zastarané*), *colloquial* (*hovorové*), and *substandard*. In the following list, the 'rehabilitated' word, printed first, is followed by one that was previously, and is even at present, often considered the more 'correct' of the two:

dráha = železnica (railroad;
cf. ČSD in 3d ii below)

drzý, col. = bezočivý
(impudent)

hasič, col. = požiarnik
(fireman)

koktať, col. = zajakávať sa
(to stutter)

konať sa = byť, uskutočniť
sa (to take place)

krabica, subst. = škatuľa
(box)

krysa = potkan (rat)

kúzelník = čarodejník
(magician)

ľadvina = oblička (kidney)

nádražie = stanica (railroad
etc. station)

nachádzať sa = byť (to be, to
exist)

neni, subst. = nie je (is not)

obnos, subst. = suma (sum)

ohľadne/ohľadom, obsol. =
vo veci (concerning, re)

perník = medovník
(gingerbread)

počas = cez, za (during)

pozde, obsol. = neskoro (late)

pravítko = lineár, obsolesc.
(ruler; cf. c1 below)

prianie = želanie (wish)
pruh = pás (stripe, strip)
rys, book. = črta (feature)
rysovať sa = črtať sa (to
loom)
skr(z)e, obsolesc. = pre (for)
snád', book. = asi, azda
(perhaps)
srand, subst. = žart (joke)
sťažnosť = ponosa
(complaint)
sťažovať sa = ponosovať sa
(to complain)

škrtat' = prečiarkovať (to
cross out)
švanda, subst. = vtip (joke)
tesnopis, obsol. = rýchlopis
úkol = úloha (task; quota)
vačok = vrečko (pocket)
vrchný = hlavný (superior)⁵
žehlička = hlaďička (iron)
žiaden = nijaký (none)
žízeň, arch. = túžba
(yearning).

Out of the 36 words quoted here, 15, that is, well over one third (41.66%) of those printed first are considered out of the mainstream of normal, stylistically unmarked literary Slovak: 5 substandard (subst.), 3 colloquial (col.), 3 obsolete (obsol.), 2 bookish (book.), 1 archaic (arch.), 1 obsolescent (obsolesc.). These words seem to have been resurrected after an earlier eclipse and have been in effect given a new lease on life due to not being labeled as 'incorrect.' This or a similar label would have relegated them to being printed, as a rule but not always, merely in normal type, if they were included at all, as has been discussed in point 1a above.

Some of these pairs are synonymous: **prianie** — **želanie**. In other cases there is some semantic, stylistic or functional differentiation: **potkan** (zool. *Rattus*) — **krysa** (zool. *Rathus* . . . ; this latter should be *Rattus* . . .) denoting also 'an insidious person.' **Stanica** (railroad station) denotes a broader concept than **nádražie**.

Many of the above first-printed words seem to be more at home in Czech than in Slovak but, due to the fact that the Slovaks and Czechs live side by side in one state, an importation of words from the numerically predominant Czech into Slovak — the ratio being 2:1 — is unavoidable.

There are scores of words that were very popular not so many years ago, definitely in the twenties and thirties:

*beza, *četník, *papršlek, *pomazánka, *stávka, *válka, *zem, *zmetok.

In the process of 'Slovakizing Slovak' after 1939, they were replaced with:

orgován, žandár, lúč, nátierka, štrajk, vojna, krajina, nepodarok (for this cf. 1a)

(lilac, gendarme, ray, bread spread, strike, war, country, 'lemon' — faulty product).

The first-quoted words (beza etc.) are no longer listed in KSSJ, not even as incorrect ones! It is hard to believe that these words have completely disappeared from, let us say, colloquial Slovak at least, for most of them are still used in Czech and, thus, can still be heard in present-day Slovakia, too.

This non-inclusion is especially striking in the case of *četník* (gendarme). It was the official term used between 1918 and at least 1938-39 and replaced with **žandár** of French origin. Although the latter is not used as an official term at present, either, it is included in KSSJ nevertheless and can be heard in the folk song "Detvianski žandári" (The gendarmes of Detva). Not used as an official term at present, either, is **polícia** but is still found included and marked as *colloqu*. While the explanation for **žandár** (v min. aj u nás; used in our area in the past, too) is printed in normal type, with **polícia** the same explanation is printed in small type (u nás v min.; for similar inconsistencies in typography, see **bubeník, notár** in 1a).

KSSJ does contain many words that refer, like the missing **četník*, to past realities no longer in existence at present in Slovakia, which fact is explained in the definition of, for instance, **žandár**. Let us consider **pandúr** (armed guard in old Hungary), **zeman** (a member of the lower gentry), etc. Although both these words are equal as to their historicity, for unknown reasons only the latter is provided with the stylistic label *hist.* (= *historizmus*). For **išpán** *hist.*, see point 4 below.

What is even more surprising is that, out of this random list of eight words, three: **beza*, **četník*, **stávka* (over one third), that have no features, phonemic or grammatical, alien to genuine Slovak, have been replaced not with other native Slovak words but with words of foreign origin: **orgován** (Turkish), **žandár** (French *gendarme*), **štrajk** (English *strike*), respectively! These cases are even more striking than is the case of **pravítko — lineár**. For, while the native **pravítko** has been 'rehabilitated,' it is the foreign synonym

lineár used earlier as a replacement for **pravítko** that is now considered obsolescent, that is, on the 'way out.'

There are more cases of this kind to be recorded: the native words **čínovník**, arch., **obnos**, subst., etc. have been eclipsed by words of foreign origin: **funkcionár**, **suma** (both Latin), respectively, etc. The word *mluvnica, imported from Czech in the nineteenth century, is no longer listed in KSSJ, either, having been replaced with the foreign term **gramatika** (Latin — Greek)!

(c) Changes in the Word-Forming Elements of Slovak.

/1/ In the course of the great wave of 'Slovakizing Slovak' itself in the late thirties and the early forties, the substantival suffixes: *--átko*, *--ítko*,⁶ *--ište*⁷ were replaced with, respectively, *--adlo*, *--idlo*, *--isko*. Nevertheless, in accord with the popular saying: 'an exception confirms the rule,' **pravítko** (ruler), as discussed in 3b above, is again acceptable, probably the only word in present-day Slovak that has been 'exonerated' although retaining the proscribed suffix, while its foreign synonym **lineár** is now considered obsolescent. Let us take a closer look at how this rule has been applied to *--adlo*, *--idlo* (previously *--átko*, *--ítko*) denoting an 'instrument.'

/i/ In some cases, the root is retained:

lehátko (sofa), *správ.* (= *správne*; correctly) **ležadlo**;
merítko (measure), *správ.* **meradlo**.

There is a deviation from, or exception to, this rule, as could have been expected: *lízatko* (lollipop), *správ.* **lízanka** (and not **lízadlo*, probably not being considered an 'instrument'; the latter form is, nevertheless, a regular word meaning 'a place for animals to lick salt').

Unlike the above cases, the formerly used form **kružítko* (a pair of compasses) is not listed in KSSJ any more, only the new form **kružidlo**.

/ii/ In other cases, again, a different word is brought in: *kukátko* (binoculars), *správ.* **dálekohl'ad**, and not the expected **kukadlo*, although the verb still remains: **kukať** (to look, to peep); *razítko* (seal, stamp), *správ.* **pečiatka**, although **razidlo**, **raziť** (to coin) do exist, but in different meanings; see point (e) below.

/iii/ The handling of the replacement of *--ište* with *--isko* is uneven. For the most part, the old forms ending in *--ište* are not

listed, only the new forms: **bojisko, hl'adisko, ihrisko, kúpalisko, nálezisko, prekladisko, prístavisko** (battlefield, auditorium, playground, swimming pool, place of find, place of reloading, harbor). Evidently, they denote a 'place, location of action.'

Nevertheless, in four cases found at random, the two formulations are placed side by side, as equivalents; surprisingly, the 'old' form is listed first in:

schodište, schodisko (staircase).

In most cases, however, the form preferred at present is placed first:

nákladisko, nákladište (loading place),

skladisko, skladište (warehouse),

zoradisko, zoradište (place of filing or assembly).

/2/ As to the suffix *--lý* previously used as an ending of adjectives and passive verbal participles, it has been replaced in most cases with as many as three other forms: *--ný, --tý, --nutý*, respectively:

urastlý* (grown up), **zastaralý* (outdated, obsolete) have changed into *urastený, zastaraný***;

opadlý* (fallen off), **zapadlý* (far-off; buried, hidden) have become *opadnutý, zapadnutý***.

Nevertheless, we do find in KSSJ a form: ***usadlý*** (settled) which, according to the above principle, should be **usadený* or **usadnutý*, these latter two forms are not, however, listed in KSSJ. Nor do we find there an analogous form **posadlý* but only the organic and expected ***posadnutý*** (possessed). While the form ***uplynulý*** (past) is labeled *kniž.* (=knížný; bookish), the form ***minulý*** (past), although ending in *--lý*, is an adjective to be distinguished from the form ***minutý***, which is the passive participle of the verb ***minúť (sa)*** (to spend; to pass).

(d) Dictionary Making and Politics.

In order for us to assess the make-up of KSSJ correctly, we have to take into consideration the conditions under which this dictionary was compiled and published, that is, in a country where linguistic matters have not infrequently been approached as political matters at the same time. The slogan, "Na Slovensku po slovensky" [(Use) Slovak in Slovakia], was a powerful weapon in the late

thirties in the political struggle for an autonomous and ultimately an independent Slovakia. Let us further illustrate our argument.

On the one hand, KSSJ is to some extent to be complimented for listing a number of especially American acronyms that may not always be readily understood by an average foreigner.⁸ Those listed include:

AP *skr.* (= skratka; abbreviation) Associated Press;

UPI [jú-pí-aj] *skr.* United Press International;

CIA [sí-aj-ej] *skr.* Central Intelligence Agency. So far, so good but here comes the rub: the English text is rendered as "Ústredná výzvedná služba," which, in its turn, means: 'central spying agency,' mistranslating the word "intelligence," which actually means 'spravodajská.' On the other hand, the parallel **CIC** [sí-aj-sí] *skr.* Counter Intelligence Corps is rendered as "Vojenská tajná služba," which, again, means 'military secret service.' All of this looks inconsistent and even confusing.

On the other hand, a correct literal translation is accorded the **FBI** [ef-bí-aj] *skr.* Federal Bureau of Investigation, rendered as "Federálny vyšetrovací úrad." Thus, in the case of the **CIA** and **CIC**, a free characteristic has been substituted for a literal translation. The **FBI** could just as suitably have been rendered as 'Federálna polícia.'

By inappropriately using the loaded word "výzvedná" (spying) and thus editorializing, instead of merely translating the acronym **CIA**, the KSSJ compilers have introduced their political bias. This becomes more pronounced in view of the opposite fact, namely, that they have 'omitted' to list the CIA's Soviet counterparts, the **KGB** and its well-known predecessors, the **NKVD**, **GPU**, and **Čeka**, undoubtedly included in books dealing with USSR history. Quite the same 'approach' to the **CIA** has been adopted by Mária Ivanová-Šalingová in her **Malý slovník cudzích slov** (A Small Dictionary of Foreign Words; Bratislava 1972), except that she does list the **NKVD** and the **Čeka**. Neither of these dictionaries lists, as could have been expected, the internationalized Russian acronym for **GULAG** that has become universally known through Alexander Solzhenitsyn's three-volume book, **The Gulag Archipelago** (1974-78), so far only published in the West but about to be brought out by the Soviet monthly *Novij Mir* "this year,"

that is, 1989.⁹ Thus, the Soviets themselves seem to be starting to show more openness (**glasnost**) about their society, while the editors of KSSJ seem to have been hampered by some fear that by including terms like **GULAG** they might be accused of divulging some unspecified 'state secrets.' As to other topical Russian terms missing in KSSJ, see point 4 below.

In this connection, P.B. Gove's comment in his Preface to **Webster 3** (1961) is highly pertinent:

Accuracy in addition to requiring freedom from error and conformity to truth requires a dictionary to state meanings in which words are in fact used, not to give editorial opinion on what their meanings should be (p.4a).

Another case with which issue must be taken is the term **čechoslovakizmus** and its definition in KSSJ as

burž. ideologicko-polit. koncepcia hlásajúca národnú jednotu Čechov a Slovákov a popierajúca samobytnosť Slovákov
(a bourgeois ideological-polit. concept promulgating the national unity of the Czechs and the Slovaks and denying the Slovaks their individuality).

A check in KSSJ's 'ancestor' of twenty-eight years ago, volume one of the academic SSJ (1959), has been most revealing: it limits the application of this term to the period of the first 'bourgeois' Czechoslovakia, that is, the period from 1918 to 1938-39, which makes quite a difference. Let us ponder the implications of the KSSJ definition by considering briefly the tragic fate of Vladimír Clementis (1902-52).

He was as dedicated a Slovak communist as any. After the mysterious 'leap' of Ján Masaryk from his window in Prague in 1948, Clementis became Czechoslovakia's foreign minister. In 1952 he was executed for having been found 'guilty,' among others, of the 'crime' of Slovak 'bourgeois nationalism,' which should be the antithesis of the above 'bourgeois Czechoslovakism.' Nonetheless, contrary to that, Clementis was neither a 'bourgeois,' nor did he advocate a complete separation of the Slovaks from the Czechs. As is well known by now, however, those who sent Clementis to the gallows committed that heinous homicide from, basically, the same positions as are attacked in the above definition, that is, "čechoslovakizmus," with that 'minor' difference, however, that

it was not 'bourgeois,' but of another color. The KSSJ qualification of the term "čechoslovakizmus" as only 'bourgeois' is, thus, strikingly one-sided and incorrect.

In this way KSSJ has somewhat blurred the distinction between an encyclopedia and a dictionary. Instead of these misguided excursions into politics, KSSJ should have totally concentrated on perfecting the linguistic apparatus of the included words — the primary function of a dictionary — so as to be of utmost help to the average user of Slovak and 'particularly the pupils and students' (p. 11), as the editors themselves claim, in the cases of uncertainty regarding the many exceptions and variant forms in grammar and spelling for which Slovak is notorious, and even feared, among its less language-conscious and foreign users. As our critique of KSSJ has brought to light, there would have been ample opportunity to do just that. It has not been done sufficiently well.

The contradictions of the existing political setup that might fall to some extent under the above definition of "čechoslovakizmus" will become evident in three more instances taken from KSSJ.

/i/ The composition of the acronym for the Czechoslovak News Agency, **ČSTK**, is rendered as "Československá tlačová kancelária." This form of the acronym is used, for instance, in the Slovak daily *Pravda* of Bratislava, while the Czech daily *Rudé právo* of Prague, unlike the KSSJ and *Pravda*, prints only **ČTK**, which in this connection should stand for "Česká tisková kancelář" (Czech News Agency).

/ii/ Similarly, the acronym **ČSD** originally, in Czech, stood for "Č(eskoslovenské) S(tátní) D(ráhy)" (Czechoslovak State Railroads). This should be rendered in Slovak, at best, as **ČŠD**, that is, "Č(eskoslovenské) Š(tátne) D(ráhy)." **ČSD** could also be interpreted as representing "Č(esko) S(lovenské štátne) D(ráhy)," which should actually result in **ČŠSD**, analogically to the above **ČSTK**. Both renderings use the word "Dráhy," instead of the more appropriate Slovak term "železnice" (railroads; see point 3b above).

/iii/ The third case concerns the popular blend **Sazka** made up of the initial elements of the Czech words "sazková kancelář" (betting office). In Slovak, the equivalent words are "stávková kancelária" and the corresponding Slovak blend would be simply **Stávka**. This form would have, however, clashed with the now pro-

scribed and unlisted word *stávka replaced with **šťrajk** (of English origin; see point 3b above), although **stávka** is acceptable in the relevant sense of 'bet.'

Regrettably, the composition of another popular blend known throughout the world, **tuzex** (a hard currency store), although listed in KSSJ, is not given. Let us venture to suggest the elements visible to the 'naked' eye of an uninitiated observer: **tuz** (= tuzemský — Czech for 'inland') **ex** (= export).

(e) Vacant Slots.

Our indepth look into the vocabulary of contemporary Slovak as presented in KSSJ has uncovered some gaps or vacant slots in its make-up.

/1/ There are a few words that look like derived ones but the supposed derivational base does not exist, in contemporary Slovak at least; or even the other way round:

/2/ Although a derivational base is considered acceptable or correct, some derivations from that base acceptable previously are classified as unacceptable now. Let us discuss a few instances:

/1/ The verb related to the noun is either incorrect or not used in Slovak:

dopisovatel' (correspondent), **písať** (to write) but **dopis** (letter), *dopisovať si* (to correspond, to write) are labeled incorrect (see point 1a above);

dotaz (question, inquiry), *obsolescent*; **dotazník** (questionnaire), **otázka** (question), **otáznik** (question mark) but *(d)(o)tázať sa, *dotazovať sa (to ask) are not listed;

nález (find, finding), **nálezisko** (place of find), **vynález** (discovery, invention) but *naliezt' (to find) is not listed;

nemluvňa (toddler), *bookish* but *mluva (speech), *mluvnica (grammar; see point (b) above), *(ne)mluviť ([not] to speak) are not listed;

poslucháč (listener), **poslucháreň** (auditorium), **sluch** (hearing), **slúchadlo** (telephone receiver; earphone) but *(po)slúchať (to listen) is not listed;

spešnina (railroad express delivery) but *spechat' (to hasten, to hurry) is not listed;

zloba (hatred, enmity) but ***zlobiť** (to anger, to irritate) is not listed, the respective meanings of the noun and the verb not being quite identical.

For more similar cases (*díeľčí, odstavec*, etc.) see point 1a above, and 3c1ii (for *kukátko, razítko*).

/2/ The verb is correct in one sense but not in another:

the noun **riadiť** (director) is correctly derived from the verb **riadiť** (to direct); since the latter has been labeled as incorrect in the sense of 'to operate a motor vehicle,' the previously used derivation ***riadič** (driver, chauffeur) is no longer listed.

Somewhat similar are the following two cases. **Batožina** (luggage) and **bieliznen** (laundry) have replaced, respectively, *zavazadlo, prádlo* labeled incorrect, although they were quite popular in the not too distant past and although they are derived from verbs considered correct even at present: **zaviazať** (to tie), **prať** (to do the laundry, to wash). See point 1a above. Similarly, **jazdiť** (to go, ride, travel), **vytknúť** (to expostulate) are correct but not ***odjazd** (departure), ***výtka** (censure, reprimand) replaced with, respectively, **odchod, výčitka**.

Out of the words quoted above, those marked with the asterisk (*) and those *italicized*, although not current in contemporary Slovak, do occur in Czech, albeit in a somewhat different form appropriate for the Czech language.

A somewhat parallel situation obtains in the case of the phrase *panelová diskusia*.¹⁰ It is an exact Slovak rendering of the English phrase "a panel discussion." In this case, however, the expected word base ***panel**, in the sense of the English 'panel, group,' does not yet exist in Slovak, and is only used in the architectural sense of 'a prefabricated building block.' Here we may witness the germ of a potential future extension of the present meaning of the word **panel**, which KSSJ may be anticipating or forestalling. See point 5b below.

(f) Consistency in Spelling.

The cases discussed above point first of all to one conclusion. If the need to observe consistency is an obvious virtue expected in any and every kind of activity, lexicographical work is no exception. On the contrary, the latter's social and cultural respon-

sibility is the greater, for its product, a dictionary, is expected to be used not only by thousands but even by millions of people. And it is in this respect that the new dictionary, KSSJ, leaves a lot to be desired.

An area of conspicuous inconsistency is that of spelling. Why the different forms: **a priori** but **apropo?** **tvíd** but **twist?** **lutz** (and not ***luc**) when **salchov** (and not ***salchow**)?

It looks somewhat forced and incongruous, if not outright ridiculous to insist on the spelling **biblia**, and not ***Biblia**, at least in the religious sense of 'Bible,' the more so since initial capitals have been duly applied in **Sväté písmo** (Holy Writ), as well as **Starý zákon** (OT) and **Nový zákon** (NT) inconsequentially interpreted as "část bible."

No explanation seems to have been given for the use of the semi-French spelling in **resumé** (correctly *résumé*), while the verb is *rezumovať*.

It is a shame indeed or maybe only hilarious that the acronym for the ruling 'fraternal' party of the close socialist neighbor and ally to the north-west, **SED**, is transliterated and divided with a lot of mistakes as **Socialistische Einheitspartei Deut-schland**, instead of the correct **Sozialistische Einheitspartei Detsch-lands**. With Slovak luckily not being current in the GDR and, thus, KSSJ not being in 'danger' of coming into mass use there, this *faux pas* may go unnoticed there and not cause any 'fraternal' falling out.

Similarly, the last word in the transliteration of the acronym UNESCO is incorrectly divided and transliterated as **Organizati-ons**, instead of the correct **Organization**, while the Slovak text has the correct singular: **Organizácia**. The same last word in **NATO** is correctly divided, though, yet wrongly spelled as **Organisa-tion**. They do get it right in their third attempt, that is, in the transliteration of such unexpected and 'indispensable' an inclusion as is **SEATO** where the last word is at last properly spelled and divided: **Organi-zation**!

Let us close this point by adding a preliminary observation to the effect that there is not only no apparent consistency but rather a considerable uncertainty, vacillation, and even chaos as to the proper spelling of many words of English origin that have entered

the Slovak language in considerable numbers. More will be said about this matter in a subsequent article.

4. Choice of Words.

This is not a mean task that confronts the compilers of any dictionary but especially one that bears in its title the crucial word **Krátky** (Short). The cardinal question is a Hamletian one:

to include/exclude, or not to include/exclude.

A viable approach would be one on the basis of a frequency count of words as has been compiled by Jozef Mistrík in his book **Frekvencia tvarov a konštrukcií v slovenčine** (Bratislava 1985). In any case, the saying does apply: "Damned if you include/exclude and damned if you don't exclude/include," for nearly each user of KSSJ will find one or more of his or her favorite or pet words missing. Let me quote just a few: *kabala, *megalopolis, *ovomaltína (a popular cocoa-like beverage), *polúcia (involuntary ejaculation), *potápka, slg. (dandy), *Slovač (the Slovaks), *svitok or *zvitok (scroll), *švajčiarsky (while there is, for inst., **švédsky** and even **bengálsky**) — this latter mainly for the sake of the proper placing of the diacritical marks, *siamský, *sibírsky, *zagniaviť (to trample), perfective, to go with **gniaviť**, imperf., and of course, last but not least, the very topical twosome that has spread recently all over the world: *glasnosť and *perestrojka! (See *GULAG in 3d.)¹¹

The words of English origin missing in KSSJ will be discussed in a subsequent article.

On the other hand, the user of KSSJ may wonder about the necessity of including such highly specialized words hardly ever met with in common daily conversation or reading, such as: **lewisit**, **selsyn**, **torr**, etc. While these are foreign loans in Slovak, I wonder how many of our non-specialist readers know what they mean.

The following is a very much more down-to-earth area, of increasing interest. KSSJ lists names of several current automobile makes:

fiatka, **mercedeska**, **moskvič**, **simka**, **škoda**, **tatra**, **trabant**, **volga**, **wartburg**, **žigulík**, as well as the former or 'late' **pragovka** and **tatraplán**.

It is surprising that the name of the very prototype of all subsequent motorcars and one that is practically synonymous with the latter generic term, the legendary *fordka, is missing; in popular language it seems to have been replaced with the form *ford, also unlisted. So, too, is the name of the earlier popular Czech make *aerovka, no longer manufactured.

On the other hand, KSSJ does teem with words the reality behind which belongs to a more or less remote past, for instance, **išpán** hist. (=historizmus) royal governor of a county (in old, pre-1918 Hungary; for *četník, see 3b above).

KSSJ includes the names of **Euklides** and **Pytagoras**; yet, for instance, the equally prestigious and deserving *Archimedes, to name just one, is missing, although his name does occur in the phrase *Archimedova veta* and the 2200th anniversary of his death in 212 B.C. was celebrated world-wide in 1988.

The compilers of KSSJ seem to have more confidence in, or a better experience with, the tranquilizer **dinyl**, while excluding the universally popular *aspirín, which may have changed its name to, or been replaced with, **acylpyrín**.

5. Definition of Word Meanings.

(a) KSSJ has adopted a useful device, namely, to make the meanings of words clearer by means of references to antonyms or opposites, for instance:

polygamia *op.* (=opozitum) monogamia, and vice versa;
zastaraný (obsolete, outdated) *op.* moderný — in this case a native word is elucidated in contrast to a foreign word.

(b) Missing Meanings.

The entry **cent** does not include a reference to its function as part of the U.S. currency. — **Mancovať sa** used to mean, in youngsters' lingo, also 'vyt'ahovať sa, vystatovať sa' (to show off). — **Napínák**, in students' slang, used to stand for 'napomienka' (reprimand).

The meaning 'krajina' (country; region, county), previously expressed also by means of the word **zem** (earth), is not even listed as inappropriate with this latter word. For **panel**, see point 3e end, above.

(c) Wrong Meanings.

Is **omša** (mass), according to KSSJ, part of only the Catholic church service? Evidently, the compilers are not church goers.

While **zhniť** means 'to rot,' *zhnité poriadky* cannot mean "zastarané," that is, 'an outdated setup/order.' Would Marcellus have meant the latter with his famous "Something is rotten (=outdated?) in the state of Denmark"? (**Hamlet**, I.4). Hardly.

(d) Appellatives.

Some of the KSSJ compilers must be fond of figure skating. This is made more than obvious by the inclusion of at least four terms:

axel, lutz, rittberger, salchow.¹²

They are explained as deriving from the names of their respective first figure-skating practitioners: Axel Paulsen, A. Lutz, W. Rittberger, U. Salchow. As to the inconsistency in spelling some of these terms, see 3f above.

The procedure of explaining some common words as deriving from personal names, as exemplified above, has not been generally, uniformly or systematically observed throughout KSSJ. Let us offer just two examples of popular words at this point. The fact that **brovning**, a type of pistol, derives its name from the American *Browning* is left unmentioned. Equally unmentioned is the fact that the popular brand of bread, **graham**, owes its name to the American *S. Graham*. Significantly, the vast majority of appellatives derived from English and American names has remained unexplained. Why? The reasons are obvious. Details will be given in a subsequent article.

6. Wrong Ordering.

Wrong alphabetic sequence: **kúzlo** (magic) should be preceded, and not followed, by **kúzliť** (to cast spells).

7. Stylistic Labeling.

KSSJ is very generous in applying stylistic labels. An outsider may often wonder about the criteria that govern the application of that stylistic yardstick. In this respect, only the following cases, noticed at random, need correction.

Hattrick is not a publ. (=publicistický; journalistic) term but one from the realm of sports, and this is how it is labeled in the academic SSJ VI.37.

The term **apartheid** comes from Afrikaans. It applies only to South Africa, which fact is not pointed out.

KSSJ uses pairs of synonymous stylistic labels, one member being foreign, the other native, the distinction between them not being made very clear, as shown in this English rendering:

archaic — obsolete (zastaraný), vulgar — gross (hrubý), substandard — non-literary (nespisovný).

Inconsistencies in, and an outright neglect of, labeling many words as coming from *American* English, to be distinguished from *British* English, will be discussed in a subsequent article.

8. 'Four-Letter' Words.

I must disappoint you, for we are not going to quote them here. We have to speak about them without them. Suffice it to say that it came as a rude shock for us to run into these expressions on the pages of the 'authoritative' KSSJ! The total of the words of this kind found in the dictionary is about twenty-five, including nine root words used as bases from which more 'four-letter' words are derived by means of additional suffixes and prefixes. One very 'fertile' word base has produced as many as six derivatives! Since these words are subject to the same rules of grammar and word formation as any other 'normal' word, you may wonder and ask with Juliet:

What's in a name? (**Romeo and Juliet**, II.2).

Let us tell you and try to satisfy your curiosity.

These peripheral words denote organs and activities of the human body (sex, excretion). Fortunately, those expressions selected (by a committee?) for inclusion in KSSJ do not belong to the hard-core obscene type that has deservedly been excluded but are of the 'milder' sort. What is to be discussed here, in spite of the rather small number of these words and their relatively 'milder' offensive nature, is the 'wisdom' and effect of their inclusion in a dictionary enjoying official sanction and one that is addressed, as stated in the introduction to KSSJ, "especially to pupils and students . . ." (p. 11, section I.1).

The professed goal of KSSJ is 'to contribute to raising the culture of language' by means of 'a strict selection of lexical units' deriving from the literary language. This does 'not allow the inclusion of words and phrases that are marginal, exclusive or isolated.' Yet, it is in the very same breath that the stated principle is violated, for they go on to speak, somewhat apologetically, it is true, about 'the merely exceptional (sic) inclusion of terms that are narrowly specialized, dialectal, slang, archaic, and rare,' while failing to refer to the fact of a simultaneous inclusion of vulgar and gross expressions. In so doing, they cherish a curious but misguided hope of 'improving' upon the stylistic standing of these marginal, substandard lexical elements. And I have failed to come across as yet any article whatsoever discussing these terms.

It is highly doubtful whether the inclusion of vulgar and gross terms is one of those vaunted means of 'raising the culture of language' and whether their being admitted into non-vulgar lexical company will take the edge of vulgarity and grossness off these words. It is illogical indeed to argue, as they do, that the 'cultural level will be raised,' while in so doing they are, ironically, lowering the standards: the actual effect of the action is the exact opposite of the twisted expectation. It is a curious 'revolutionary' idea indeed to expect that culture can be raised by the help of, among others, vulgarity and grossness!

Since KSSJ has the backing of the highest political authorities in the country and has been produced by the leading official language institution, there is no doubt that such a momentous decision as the one to include vulgar and gross terms must itself enjoy, directly or indirectly, the sanction of the highest authorities. If we give this even the minimum of thought, we cannot but conclude that it is a sorry state of affairs when the professed goal of 'raising the culture of language' is subverted by those very people who make this claim. We wonder, however, to what extent this 'loosening up' has been prompted, among others, also by the recent trend — in American lexicography! Our curiosity in this respect is prompted by the fact that the stated goals of KSSJ (1987) are, strangely, very close indeed to those formulated in **Webster's Third New International Dictionary** of 1961, which 'has been prepared with a constant regard for the needs of the high school and col-

lege student . . . The dictionary more than ever is the indispensable instrument of understanding and progress." (Preface).

With KSSJ being addressed, like Webster 3, 'especially to pupils and students,' there is one single, straightforward question to be put to the compilers:

Are the pupils and students, in their oral presentations in class and in written tests, as well as at home, supposed to be free to use any of the words listed in KSSJ, including the vulgar and gross terms? Will the use, by the students or anyone else, for that matter, of these latter terms contribute to 'raising their cultural standard'?

Our answer: Hardly so. To us all this appears like a very dubious proposition. Once a vulgar or gross word makes its entry into a dictionary, especially one that aims at achieving prestige, the dubious word itself comes to enjoy some of that prestige, too, for hardly anyone among non-specialists pays attention to stylistic labels, in the same way as an average dictionary user very seldom takes the trouble of reading the introduction to a dictionary, however short the latter may be. It seems as if these items — an introduction and stylistic labeling — are included in a dictionary merely to please and appease the specialist.

Out of these roughly nine root words appearing in twenty-five word forms, most are labeled "hrubé" (gross) and the other again 'vulgar' in KSSJ. Let us see how these two labels are applied to other cases.

Used in the sense of 'nipple, teat, pap,' the word **cecok** is a regular, 'normal,' stylistically unmarked word. When employed to refer to a *female breast*, however, it is labeled 'vulgar.'

The adjective **teplý** (warm), besides its regular, 'normal' functions, is used in its fifth function to denote a 'homosexual,' which usage is labeled 'gross' (hrubé) in KSSJ. It seems that on the strength of the four 'positive' functions, this fifth use of the word **teplý**, rather than to be termed 'gross,' should be considered a euphemism. This can also apply to the English **gay**, which, surprisingly also in its fifth, and last, sense denotes a 'homosexual' labeled 'slang' in **The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language** (1969). It seems that the academic SSJ IV.449 is closer to the mark when labeling **teplý** — in its fifth sense here, too, —

as 'lower colloquial,' while the other 'gross' words of KSSJ are labeled 'vulgar' in the academic SSJ. On the other hand, it is far from clear why one word, **cecok**, is labeled 'vulgar' in KSSJ, while the other words of this group are termed 'gross,' both labels, "hrubý" (gross) — "vulgárny," being defined as synonymous in KSSJ.

CONCLUSION

Forty years ago, the late A.V. Isačenko formulated the tasks of the linguists, including lexicographers, in this way: 'to direct actively the development of language, . . . to democratize the standard language.'¹³ 'Democratization' does not mean 'vulgarization.' Linguists, thus, have a great responsibility not merely to record their language passively but, as specialists, to get actively, constructively, and positively involved in the creative shaping of its development.

NOTES

*For their valuable comments on this review essay, I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Louise B. Hammer of Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, the editor Dr. M. Stolarik, and some colleagues in Bratislava, who wish to remain anonymous. For an earlier review of the KSSJ by J.M. Kochik, see *Slovakia* 33 (1987-88), pp. 108-109.

¹ Matilda Hayeková, *Dejiny slovenských slovníkov do r. 1945*. Bratislava 1979.

² Vincent Blanár in his review of the KSSJ, *Slovenská reč*, 53 (1988), No. 3, p. 185: " . . . prečo sú slová *chyba*, *porucha* vhodnejšie ako *závada*, keď sa tie slová významove celkom nekryjú . . . ?"

³ A cryptic allusion to Alexander Dubček here?

⁴ In her review of the KSSJ, *Slavica slovaca*, 23 (1988), No. 3, p. 279.

⁵ Viera Slivková, "Vrchný rozhodca, vrchná sestra — hlavný rozhodca, hlavná sestra?" *Kultúra slova*, 21 (1987), No. 4, pp. 126-27.

⁶ Štefan Peciar, "Slovenské ekvivalenty českých výrazov na --tko," *ibid.*, 2 (1968), No. 10, pp. 329-35.

⁷ Ferdinand Buffa, "Slová na --isko, --ište v spisovnej slovenčine," *Slovenské odborné názvoslovie*, 6 (1958), No. 5, pp. 129-32.

⁸ Matej Považaj, "Skratky a značky a ich spracovanie v KSSJ," *Kultúra slova*, 18 (1984), No. 7, pp. 225-31.

⁹ David Remnick, "Soviet Journal To Publish 'Gulag'," *The Washington Post* -- Style, April 21, 1989, C1, C9.

¹⁰ Ján Horecký, "Čo je panelová diskusia?" *Kultúra slova*, 18 (1984), No. 10, pp. 380-81.

¹¹ For **glasnost'**, see the *Pravda* (Bratislava), January 19, 1989, p. 2. --In an editorial, "V znamení prestavby," the term "glasnost'" is not mentioned at all in *Slavia slovac*, 23 (1988), No. 2, pp. 113-14.

¹² Alena Anettová, "Axel, Rittberger — axel, rittberger," *Kultúra slova*, 20 (1986), No. 3, pp. 84-86.

¹³ A.V. Isačenko, "Základy materialistickej jazykovedy," *Slovenská reč*, 15 (1949-50), Nos. 3-4, p. 71.

This article was written before Czecho-Slovakia's 'velvet revolution' of 17 November 1989. A Slovak version is to be published in the *Pohľady* (Montreal).

REVIEWS

Dejiny Slovenska, II (1526-1848). Vladimír Matula, Jozef Vozár *et. al.*
Bratislava: Veda, 1987. 846 pp.

GAVIN LEWIS

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
The City University of New York

This is the second of a six-volume series sponsored by the Slovak Academy of Sciences. The series was conceived and realized in the days when the Marxist orientation of Slovak historical scholarship was taken for granted; and it was intended to provide a detailed, scholarly, and authoritative handbook, superseding all earlier accounts, both "bourgeois" and Marxist, of all aspects of the history of the Slovak land and people from prehistory to the present. The authors of the volume under review have succeeded so well that it should serve its purpose even in the new era that began in 1989.

The authors of Volume II, covering the early modern period, have had a particularly difficult task. Their period, running from 1526 to 1848, is both long and complex, including a great many closely interrelated developments. The Turkish conquest and the Habsburg reconquest of much of Hungary; the efforts of the Habsburgs to absorb the Hungarian kingdom into their hereditary territories and the varying responses of the Hungarian nobility to these efforts; the evolution of serfdom and seigneurialism, urban life and the mining industry; the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, the Renaissance and Enlightenment; and finally, the complex cultural and social phenomenon of the National Awakening; all these had to be discussed both individually and in their relation to each other.

The authors have accomplished this task to an impressive extent. Though the book is of course written from a Marxist viewpoint, the omissions and distortions typical of vulgar Marxism have been avoided. The importance of religious belief, and the leading role of the Catholic and Protestant clergy in early modern Slovak history, are given due weight. The leaders of the National Awakening, though discussed in terms of the Marxist schema, are treated

as real historical actors and not as mere puppets of the "transition from feudalism to capitalism." Some of the lengthy discussions on topics such as the evolution of prices and wages or the structure of internal trade may seem too detailed to those who are not convinced of the metaphysical importance of such matters, but on the whole the Marxist stress on economic and social themes has led to increased understanding of the development of the Slovak nation.

Perhaps the most significant single achievement of this volume is to lay to rest for ever the myth of the pre-nineteenth century Slovaks as a slumbering nation of peasants and shepherds with no elite other than a sprinkling of clergy. The sections dealing with social structure, education and culture, and national development from the sixteenth to the early eighteenth centuries make the following facts abundantly clear. 1) The Slovaks had a substantial elite of nobles and townsmen as well as priests and ministers, indeed the secular elite formed the milieu that enabled the clergy to operate. 2) This elite was open to the influences of Renaissance humanism and its descendants, the emerging historical scholarship of the seventeenth century, as well as to the Reformation, the Counter-Reformation, and the Baroque. 3) Under these intellectual, cultural, and religious influences, the Slovak elite built up a pre-modern national self-awareness comparable with that of other eastern European nations in the early modern period.

This understanding of the early modern Slovak nation is not only of importance in itself, it is also of significance for explaining more recent periods of Slovak history. The National Awakening becomes easier to understand when one realizes that it did not come from nowhere, but was rather a phase — albeit a decisive and innovative one — in a continuing social and cultural development. Likewise, the nineteenth-century development of the awakening acquires a new dimension when one realizes that it took place against the background of the crumbling of the traditional Slovak elite under the onslaught of Magyarization: one of the main tasks of the leaders of the awakening was that of mobilization, to rally what was left of the elite so as to ensure the survival of the nation.

The section of the book dealing with the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries — that is the National Awakening itself,

the final decades of seigneurialism, and the beginnings of national conflict within the Hungarian state — are in some ways less satisfactory than the earlier sections. Individual chapters are thorough and informative, and there is the same complete coverage of political, social, economic, cultural, and intellectual developments. But there is less sense than in the first half of the book of the interrelatedness of the various developments. In particular, the very detailed discussion of the viewpoints, activities, and disputes of the various leaders of the awakening proceeds to some extent in isolation from the social background. How did the leaders react to the defection of much of the traditional Slovak elite, and how did they mobilize those who were left? To what extent was the National Awakening a response of the nationally “loyal” elite to pressures to Magyarize? In general, what determined individual members of the elite either to Magyarize or to support the awakening? In spite of a number of fascinating glimpses — in particular, the section on the rise of the Slovak intelligentsia and village notables (pp. 579-84) — one gets surprisingly little sense of the National Awakening as a movement apart from its leading personalities.

In spite of these criticisms, the book as a whole deserves to be widely read. It provides an excellent guide for students and point of departure for scholars, and can and should be used in this way even under the new order of things in the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic. Appearing as it did in 1987, the volume summarizes the achievements of the era of Marxist domination in the early modern field of Slovak historical scholarship. One must give credit where credit is due, and admit that at least in this field, Slovak Marxist scholars over the last forty years have contributed significantly to their nation’s understanding of itself.

Viliam Čičaj. *Knižná kultúra na strednom Slovensku v 16.-18. storočí*. Bratislava: Veda, 1985. 133 pp.

R. VLADIMIR BAUMGARTEN
Tallahassee, Florida

This book outlines the development of literary culture in central Slovakia between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, focus-

ing on the towns of Banská Bystrica, Banská Štiavnica, and Kremnica. It is divided among an introduction, a quantitative analysis of "private" (non-archival) literature of the region, the thematic structure of such literature, and the relationship of the literary culture of central Slovakia with the later Middle Ages.

In the introductory section Čičaj points out that, while other Slovak areas were producing literature in this period, the region of Banská Bystrica-Banská Štiavnica-Kremnica was far more prolific in sheer output. He elaborates on this point in Part One, employing statistical charts very liberally. In addition to publications in the Czech language (used extensively by the Protestants since the Hussite emigration from Bohemia in the Thirty Years' War) and the Central Slovak dialect, there were also numerous publications in Latin and German. Latin was at that time the official language of the Kingdom of Hungary, while the Germans in the central mining towns were using their language to introduce the works of Martin Luther. The period was consequently marked by lively literary interactions between the Protestants of Upper Hungary and Lutheran centers of learning in Germany.

In Part Two, where Čičaj discusses the thematic structures of this literary awakening, he reveals several facts which are somewhat surprising and certainly revealing in light of their historical importance. Quite naturally Lutheran theology was the focus of a large percentage of the publications, but works dealing with history, political science, and geography (the last-named social science included books about places as remote as Jamaica and Japan) were also produced. One criticism of Luther offered by Catholic apologists was that, in referring to Aristotle as "a dog of a philosopher," the father of Protestantism disrupted the centuries-old dialogue between Christian and classical (pagan, pre-Christian) civilization. Slovak Lutherans may justifiably exempt themselves from such a charge. Publications emanating from the central Slovak towns represented not only Aristotle and the Greeks, but also Boccaccio, Petrarch, and Italian humanists of the Renaissance period. Such a state of affairs reflects the ecumenical nature of Upper Hungary in this period. Catholics and Lutherans in the central Slovak towns lived together amicably when Habsburg pressure was not applied.

Čičaj attempts to elaborate on this point in Part Three, pointing out that the Catholic Erasmus and the Protestant Luther each contributed to a general advancement of education in the face of a feudal order. But here Čičaj falls short of the mark. Having demonstrated that the Central Slovak region was cosmopolitan in the literary sense, he does not follow through by demonstrating its impact on the later Slovak national awakening. Part of the problem here may stem from the very exclusiveness of his study; he might have formulated his conclusions more completely by not simply concentrating on three towns. Even so, he could have integrated this study into the general framework of this period in Slovak and Hungarian history. It was not only the time of the Protestant Reformation; it was also a time when the Turks occupied the middle Danube region (sometimes making incursions into the highlands), and when Transylvanian nobles invaded the area in their struggles against the Habsburgs. Citing contemporary literature regarding the impressions produced by these events might have strengthened the author's case.

Knižná kultúra is dry reading, but it is nonetheless a significant contribution to the study of Slovak literary history. The author clearly demonstrates that the Central Slovak region's contribution to literary culture precedes the national awakening, and he makes liberal use of footnotes to support his case. This book is primarily useful for literary historians.

Viera Urbancová, *Slovenská etnografia v 19. storočí: Vývoj názorov na slovenský ľud*. Martin: Matica slovenská, 1987. 436 pp.

MAGDA ZELINSKA FERL
Los Angeles, California

Slovenská etnografia v 19. storočí is an ambitious work which examines the evolution of ethnography in Slovakia, specifically the trends which contributed to the eventual development of a separate discipline during the 19th century. Viera Urbancová's thesis is that Slovak ethnography as a discipline evolved through stages and was influenced by social and political activities.

Her work is organized according to the notions which influenced the various stages of the discipline's development, from the backward and irrational view of the folk to the idealized. These notions coincided with the interests of the intelligentsia in such causes as the "fight against superstition," which was thought to prevent social progress, the promotion of national self-awareness, the struggle to codify the Slovak language, and the attempts to establish ethnography as an independent discipline.

Urbancová points out some practical reasons for interest in the folk. Mass education, according to her, was instituted by capitalists during the period of industrialization for the purpose of developing a better worker and increasing productivity. The folk needed to be re-educated regarding their customs and beliefs which were thought to hamper progress. The first ethnographic work began with the premise that the folk who believed in superstitions should be studied so they could be re-educated and, thereby, elevated to a level where they could contribute to the welfare of the nation. Matej Bel's work, *Notitia*, is mentioned as important to the ethnographic research of the 19th century.

The author also deals with the romantic notion of the folk which, in Slovakia, was influenced by Herder and Hegel's philosophy. The historical past was seen in terms of pride and love for the language: Bernolák's followers saw it in a Slovak language, while the Lutheran intelligentsia beheld it in the language of the Kráľice Bible. Kollár and Šafárik were important at this time in promoting interest in folk culture, which to them was oral literature. They collected songs, proverbs, and beliefs which pointed to the ancient character of the nation. This state in the development of Slovak ethnography is characterized by the hypothesis, initiated by linguists, that Slavs can trace their culture to Indo-European origins.

During the 1840's and the 1850's there was wide acceptance of the view that folklore expressions were survivals of ancient culture. Such assumptions contributed to the notion that folklore was dying out and, therefore, needed to be collected and recorded. Gustáv, Reuss, a physician, was very influential during this period in promoting the collection of tales. In his historical work concerning the development of regions, how they were populated,

how people secured food, etc., he supported his conclusions with information extracted from folk culture, especially local legends.

During the period of the 1860's there was a sentiment to view ethnography from a scientific perspective, promoting a systematic approach to collecting. Pavol Dobšinský published instructions on how to collect ethnographic materials. His greatest contribution was expanding the collected genres; for example, he called for the inclusion of material culture which he referred to as "prostonárodné poklady" (folk treasures.) He also encouraged a geographical approach to the study of such occupations as lacemakers, boatwrights, and tinkers, and stressed the importance of noting the tools and their use.

Lastly, Urbancová points to the trend of increased interest in mythology. The work of the brothers Grimm in Germany contributed to the view that myths are the survivals of ancient rituals and, consequently, Reuss and others believed that myths collected in Slovakia reflected not only old Slovak culture but also Slavic cultures. Folk life was romanticized and looked upon as the basis of the nation's culture which needed to be preserved for future generations. The work of Dobšinský became very popular and influential. The first part of his *Prostonárodné obyčaje, zvyky a povery* is structured according to the natural life cycle: birth, marriage and death. He describes family, village and commercial life in detail.

Unfortunately, the attempt to cover such a large span of time results in a book which has no depth to its analysis or interpretations. One is left feeling that, despite copious notes and an extensive bibliography, the book is somehow incomplete, lacking a clear thesis. However, this is a rather comprehensive work of Slovak ethnographic scholarship concerning the 19th century. Implicitly, it offers an interesting explanation concerning changes in the approach to ethnography which actually relate to the major European trends of the 19th century.

Národná svetlica: Výber dokumentov k dejinám Matice slovenskej. Edited by Michal Eliáš and Vojtech Šarluška. Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988. 321 pp.

JOHN A. BERTA
Methodist College
Fayetteville, North Carolina

Although *Národná svetlica* offers nothing new to the professional study of the Matica slovenská, it is of value to the average individual interested in the history of this institution and Slovak culture. The book comes at an opportune time. Slovaks abroad, particularly in the United States and Canada, have a growing interest in Slovak culture, and many perceive the Matica as the primary vehicle for engaging in cultural exchanges. The work is also important for contemporary Slovakia since many Slovaks there have little or no knowledge of the Matica's history and function.

Národná svetlica is divided into three segments which discuss the Matica's role in a particular period. The first era, 1863-1875, deals with the Matica's beginnings, and the legacy left to Slovak history and culture after its forced closure by the Magyar authorities. The second period, 1919-1954, concerns the task the resurrected Matica sought to fulfill as the ethnic and cultural guardian of the Slovak people. The final segment, 1954 to the present, involves a period when the Matica assumed functions which could equate it to the National Archives and Library of Congress in the United States. The book is a compilation of excerpts from proclamations, the minutes of Matica board meetings and assemblies, articles, books, pamphlets, personal correspondence and photographs which pertain to the evolution of this institution, and the role it has played in the preservation of Slovak culture and ethnicity in Slovakia and abroad. The documents reproduced in each section were selected to impress upon the Slovak reader the importance of the Matica slovenská as a symbol of his/her national identity and culture, and as an active participant in daily Slovak life.

The drawback to this otherwise skillfully edited work is that it was published solely in Slovak. Only those with a working

knowledge of the language can make use of its wealth of information. The two-page English summary provides the reader with just a hint of what is in the body of the work. If the Matica slovenská could make this and similar publications available in English, it could have an impact on rejuvenating ethnic awareness among those who are on the verge of being assimilated into another culture. Also missing is the wealth of correspondence regarding how Slovaks abroad relate to this symbol of their Slovak heritage.

Jan Kmeč, *Jugoslovensko-slovačke slavističke veze*. Novi Sad: Vojvodjanska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1987. 549 p.

JÁN FRÝDECKÝ
Burnaby, British Columbia

The author of this work traces the relations of the South Slavs with the Slovaks from the time of the early Slavic migrations to Central Europe and the Balkans to the present. He explores the same geographic and topographic names preserved to this day in Yugoslavia and Slovakia. Other proof of close contacts are so called "yugoslavisms" which Pannonian Slavs accepted from the South Slavs and which are preserved in the contemporary Slovak literary language. Further, he refers to the activities of Saints Cyril and Methodius and the Cyrilomethodian culture which originated from direct social and cultural efforts and productive contacts of the forefathers of the Slovaks and the Yugoslavs.

Although the author wrote that Pannonian Slavs were very often different from South Slavs, he did not realize that this long separation conditioned also gradual national differences between the forefathers of today's Slovaks and the South Slavs. He used only the term "staroslovansky" contrary to the recognized term "starosloviensky".

After the extinction of Great Moravia and the rise of Hungary, the greatest avenue for cooperation between West and South Slavs was the Catholic Church. In Hungary the Church accepted a group of Czech missionaries and through their contacts and exchange of

priests, created the possibility for spiritual and cultural communication, which produced cultural, literary and artistic works.

The author devotes the third part of his book to the period of Turkish rule in Central Europe (1526-1683). Many refugees from Croat regions came to Bratislava and settled in the southern parts of Slovakia and Moravia. New Yugoslav-Slovak spiritual, cultural and literary relations blossomed. These were strengthened through the Hungarian Catholic center in Trnava, where the Jesuit university accepted Croat students and professors.

The fourth part covers the period from the origins of the Protestant lyceum in Bratislava (1615) to the establishment of the Serbian grammar school in Sremski Karlovci (1791). The lyceum became a center of Yugoslav-Slovak relations from the first half of the 18th century. Many Serbs studied in Bratislava and in other schools in Slovakia, especially when they emigrated from southern and middle Serbia in the Hungarian portion of the Austrian Empire (1690). Also Slovaks started to move to the Vojvodina from the year 1745. As a defense against Catholic pressure, and in an effort to build their own cultural institutions and schools, the Serbs needed their own educated people. Many educated Slovaks worked among Serbs for this reason.

In the first twenty years of the 19th century a new period in Yugoslav-Slovak relations began. The national revival of both peoples led to greater mutual cooperation. The awakening of national consciousness among the Slavic nations manifested itself as well with the idea of Slavic reciprocity. An association of "Lovers of Slovak Language and Literature" in Pešt was also a center of cooperation with Czechs, Croats, Serbs and Russians and a center of research in Slavic languages.

In the last part of his work Kmeć covers the time from the 1848 revolution to the present. He pays attention to Štúr's views, to the differences between Štúr and Kollár, to relations between Njegoš and Štúr, and to Yugoslav motifs and subjects in Slovak literature. Under the pressure of the Hungarian government, Yugoslav-Slovak relations became very strained, and student organizations had to move to Prague. Slovaks from Vojvodina, with the center in Bački Petrovac, became a bridge between Slovaks and Serbs in Hungary. In the period between the two wars of the 20th century, the author

mentions Slovak authors in Vojvodina, translators, and some political events.

The work of professor Kmeč is a solid contribution in the areas of Slavic reciprocity. The author buttressed his work with many footnotes and with the biographies of many authors. While this did not reduce the worth of the work, it unnecessarily widened it and the author deflected from his theme. Serbian-Slovak relations, about which Slovaks and Serbes have written a lot, is compiled in detail, but less attention is paid to Croat-Slovak relations. Incomprehensible to me is why the author presented the number of votes in the elections of 1920, and also why he gives the number of members of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia in Slovak towns in the Vojvodina, and also why he lists the names and jobs of some Slovaks, members of the Communist Party, who emigrated to Slovakia. All of this detracts from an otherwise worthy book.

Josef Kalvoda, *The Genesis of Czechoslovakia*. Boulder, Colorado: East European Monographs (Distributed by Columbia University Press), 1986. 673 pp.

GREGORY C. FERENCE
Salisbury State University
Salisbury, Maryland

This massive work is certainly a must for anyone interested in the study of the formation of the Czechoslovak state. It is obvious that the author has spent extensive periods of time researching this subject at archives in Austria, Czechoslovakia, and the United States. Kalvoda should be commended for his use of innumerable memoirs, journals, newspapers, and secondary sources published in Czech, English, French, German, Russian, and Slovak. As a result, the author presents a well thought-out and thoroughly synthesized portrayal of the events and people involved in the intensive four year quest for national independence. The author provides great detail concerning this struggle both in Austria-Hungary and abroad in England, France, Russia, and the United States, while accomplishing his goal of examining and evaluating the three theses

regarding the success of the liberation movement: 1) the work of exiles, 2) the Bolshevik Revolution, and 3) the resistance at home. Kalvoda's book proves all three were factors leading to Czechoslovak independence.

Kalvoda definitively characterizes the major personalities involved in the movement to create an independent state, among these Edvard Beneš, Josef Dürich, Karel Kramář, Milan Štefánik, and Tomáš G. Masaryk. The author in particular, provides a very provocative description of Masaryk, the "Liberator-President" of Czechoslovakia. Masaryk left Bohemia in 1914 as a relatively insignificant political leader. Despite later assertions that he had a mandate for his mission, in reality Masaryk lacked any significant support at home. Masaryk schemed and plotted to become the leader of the liberation movement, subverting the authority of Dürich, who had been sent abroad to represent Czech interests in foreign capitals. To achieve his goals the ruthless Masaryk worked to destroy the reputations, careers, and influence of others, such as Dürich and Kramář, when their opinions and activities were contrary to his and those of the Czecho-Slovak National Council. Masaryk thus is shown as an opportunist who, despite his later claims, adroitly changed his ideas and statements when it became politically expedient.

In his account of the origins of the Czechoslovak-Bolshevik conflict, Kalvoda reveals that both Masaryk's insistence on the neutrality of the Czecho-Slovak Legions in Russian internal affairs, and his attempts to gain western recognition of Lenin almost caused the loss of Allied support for Czechoslovak statehood. The activities of the Legions in Siberia when the local situation dictated an independent course of action in support of anti-Bolshevik forces, although contrary to the orders of Masaryk, ultimately preserved Masaryk's position in the west.

It is a bit disappointing that Kalvoda does not analyze more thoroughly events within Slovakia and the role which Slovak émigrés, particularly in the United States, played in the creation of the state. Also, his examination of how Ruthenia became part of the republic is almost non-existent. The author's discussion of pre-war Slovak political life in Hungary, mentioning neither the political parties nor the voting irregularities which kept the number

of Slovak deputies at a minimum, is highly abbreviated. This commentary seems almost to be an afterthought to Kalvoda's overview of Czech political life in Austria. As well, his treatment of the Masaryk-Pekař controversies, which weighs the first chapter down, is entirely out of proportion to their significance.

This book is not for the novice in the history of the Czechs and Slovaks. Without a firm understanding of the past of these two peoples, the reader would quickly become confused. Although Kalvoda's narrative provides excellent detail, at times it appears as if he included all material he had found regarding a particular topic, thereby clouding the issue. One such example occurs when Masaryk recommends the Tsarevich as the commander of the Czecho-Slovak Legions (p. 97). It is difficult to believe that Masaryk or any rational person in the modern age would want an eleven- or twelve-year-old boy to lead troops. A more discriminating choice of material would have been sufficient in many cases.

There are numerous minor factual flaws which should have been caught in the editing process, including the statement that Francis Joseph ruled for 64 years (p. 159); and that an Austrian archduke was a "Grand Duke" (p. 78). In giving his estimates on the number of Slovak and Czech immigrants in the United States, the author relied too heavily upon secondary sources. A quick referral to the documents of the Census Bureau and/or the Department of Labor would have provided a more accurate count.

However, the greatest drawback of this work is the overall inattentive editing. This has resulted in missing footnote citations, wrong chapter headings, and numerous errors including transposed as well as missing letters. It appears almost as if no one bothered to proofread this volume. Although a one page "Errata" is included, it also contains errors, and is wholly inadequate. The informed reader can usually correct these mistakes, but it is a slow and tedious task causing the cohesiveness of this work to suffer. Despite these shortcomings, Kalvoda's book is a welcome addition to the study of Czechoslovak statehood. In the years to come it will remain a fundamental reference source in English for the study of this complex issue.

Dejiny Slovenska, VI (1945-1960). Michael Baranovský *et. al.*
Bratislava: Veda, 1988. 549 pp.

STANISLAV J. KIRSCHBAUM
York University, Glendon College
Toronto, Canada

It would have been difficult to review this volume with any degree of equanimity or detachment even before the events of November and December 1989 which ended the Communist monopoly of power in Czechoslovakia and laid bare the bankruptcy of the ideology, the economic and political system, not to mention the tragedies that it left in its wake. The triumphalist tone, the self-deluding interpretations of social and individual progress, the ever-present statistics and the cowed reverence to the Soviet Union are characteristics not of scholarship, but of crass political partisanship.

The authors divide the history of the period under consideration into two parts. First they look at what is referred to as the national and democratic revolution and its transformation into a socialist one. This is basically a year by year presentation of events from the end of the Second World War to the Communist coup d'Etat in February 1948. In the second part of the book, also chronologically divided, they examine the various aspects involved in building socialism. The volume is filled with statistics on economic development and other indicators of social and cultural activity. The study ends with the proclamation of the achievement of socialism in Czechoslovakia with the Constitution of 1960. The interpretation that is offered follows the line adopted after federalization and Gustáv Husák's accession to the position of Secretary General of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia.

The Marxist approach to history and politics is based on the concept of the class struggle. There is no doubt that there was a class struggle in Slovakia in the period under consideration; but it was one that was imposed on that society by those whom Milovan Djilas very quickly identified as members of a new class, the Communist Party, their mentors and their allies. That is not all. The Communists were also bent on changing the social and economic

structures of the country; change them they did, but not in the way portrayed. The essays in this volume by historians, members of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, outline their perceptions of how the Communists went about achieving their objectives. In the case of Slovakia, this involved industrialization in order to raise it to the level of the Czech Lands, and the exercise of political power supposedly by the working class during a period which was to pave the way for the establishment of a socialist society. The essays stress particularly the industrialization process, the collectivization of agriculture and the transformation of the political system into a one-party state. In fact, what the Communists did was to eliminate all political or class opponents, allow Slovakia to be ruled from Prague, set into motion its forced industrialization, establish a political, cultural and economic dictatorship, create privileges for themselves, and rule over a population which they cowed into submission by the extensive use of terror. This is the story that this book does not tell.

Equally unsatisfactory is the way the authors deal with some of the problems, often in direct contradiction to their proclaimed principles, which arose from the policies of the Communists. A good example is the way Barnovský handles what he calls the national question: "The beginning of the industrialization of Slovakia led to the elimination of the existing inequality of the Slovak nation. Despite this positive result, the mutual relations between Czechs and Slovaks were not solved along Leninist principles . . . This reality negatively influenced political life in Slovakia and slowed down the development of socialist relations between the two brotherly nations" (p. 226). No explanation is given for such a conclusion; no analysis of Slovak political life is offered. Indeed there is no indication of the contents of the relations between Czechs and Slovaks, let alone their socialist relations, whatever that means.

Jiří Šťátný, author of the last chapter, writes in conclusion: "The fifties and sixties were a turning point for Slovak society; it acquired all the characteristics of a society which went through revolutionary changes and built the bases of socialism. However, this does not mean that all of the tasks for the passage from capitalism to socialism were fulfilled" (p. 507). Given the revolution of 1989, it is more accurate to conclude that probably none of

the tasks were in fact fulfilled and that the bases of socialism were not laid. It is now also doubtful that socialism, whatever it is supposed to be, can ever be built.

The task that Slovak historians face henceforth is to define and analyze exactly what happened and what was built in this period. The answers to these questions will not be found in this volume.

Jim and Susan Borchert. *Lakewood: The First Hundred Years*. Norfolk, VA: The Donning Company for the Lakewood Historical Society, 1989. 191 pp.

CAROL TOWARNICKY
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Every year the eighth graders at Sts. Cyril and Methodius School in Lakewood, Ohio, were given a special job.

At Christmastime we were to deliver the small boxes of church collection envelopes and — pro-rated for each family — several wafers each of *oplatky* for use at the Christmas Eve *vilija*.

I was to deliver to the block of upper Clarence Avenue, where nearly every family belonged to "Cyril's." I had a few extra *oplatky* at my discretion, but it wasn't nearly enough to suit the grandmothers who demanded more. Sorry, they'd have to get them after Mass on Sunday. I said it politely, of course, but probably somewhat officiously, too.

. . . It was a very long time before I realized that most children in America never delivered *oplatky* door-to-door. Actually, it was a very long time before I wasn't startled to meet an older person who spoke un-accented English. In the Lakewood, Ohio where I grew up, all grandparents came from Slovakia.

Lakewood, Ohio, was a place where it was possible, even into the 1960s, to live secure in a world apart. I actually grew up thinking that, no matter what I saw on TV, most people in the word were Slovak-Americans. Imagine my surprise.

"Lakewood: The First Hundred Years," the new book by Jim and Susan Borchert prepared for my hometown's centennial last

year, accents the feelings of those small islands in the streetcar suburb next to Cleveland.

As experts in urban and ethnic life the Borcherts have produced far more than the standard coffee-table picture book. They have explained why things were the way they were.

As we used to say, all Lakewood was divided into three parts, and they had hardly anything to do with each other. There was the area along Lake Erie where the rich WASPs lived (they had fenced off most of the lakefront for themselves). We had hardly any contact with them.

There was "middle Lakewood," of the middle class, which consisted of marvelous, prosperous housing. (The Borcherts point out that much of it was built from kits supplied by *Sears, Roebuck!*) Middle Lakewood is where the kids who called us "greenhorns" were from. We had no idea what "greenhorns" were, of course (and they probably didn't, either.). So we mostly were puzzled, rather than insulted.

And then there was home, "Birdtown" and environs. The nickname came from the fact that many of the streets in this old-world enclave were named for birds — Plover, Quail, Lark, Thrush. The Borcherts say that the people who lived there called it The Village, but I never heard anyone call it that. Perhaps they called it that in Slovak, which most people of my generation never learned.

In their book the Borcherts have chosen to focus on each of these parts of Lakewood individually, and the result is a mirror of how it actually was — each group pursuing its destiny pretty much in isolation from the others, mostly coexisting, but never meshing.

There were the founders, the captains of industry, who named the streets not only after their family names, but after their children's first names — the Nicholsons and Wagers and Wintons, and the children named Grace and Clarence and Charles. They carved estates from the wilderness, planted orchards, and lived a life of High Society. One of my favorite pictures in "Lakewood" is that of Marion Campbell, the third Mrs. Alexander Winton, dressed in Native American dress as the lead in "the Seminole," an opera she presented in her back yard!

There were the middle Lakewoodites, the merchants and the others a couple rungs up the assimilation ladder.

And there were the Slovak-Americans, who built their little world around the factories which hired immigrant labor — National Carbon Company, Empire Brass . . . Once again, I am impressed at the industriousness and dedication of our ancestors. Starting with nothing, they created a space for themselves.

Their frugality was legendary. Sts. Cyril and Methodius Church was paid for in record time, as were its renovations. I can still remember, as a school child, using pencil erasers to remove heel marks from the expensive new linoleum floors put in the school in the 50s.

But the story of “Lakewood” also emphasized how fragmented even the “Village” was. In the book the Borcherts quote from the chronicle of *Slovaks of Cleveland and Lakewood* by Ján Pankuch, a newspaperman and historian. Pankuch came to Lakewood in 1917, so his history drew on the memories of the earliest settlers from around the turn of the century.

They came seeking work, built homes to be near it, then founded their churches, their savings and loans, and their clubs.

But when I was growing up in Lakewood I knew none of this, and I suspect it was because Ján Pankuch was a Lutheran, who helped found Sts. Peter and Paul Lutheran Church, at the corner of my street, Grace Avenue. Back then — and it’s really not so long ago, is it? — the Roman Catholics had nothing to do with the Greek Catholics at St. Gregory’s or the Orthodox or the — heavens! — Slovak Calvinists in the little white church.

It was a time of suspicion, and because of it, something important was missed.

It’s why today I can meet someone from Lakewood about my own age but from one of the different “parts,” and realize that he/she literally grew up in a different town.

Jim and Susan Borchert have done a masterful job of drawing together those separate threads.

Ābel Krāl'. *Pravidlá slovenskej výslovnosti*. 2nd ed. Bratislava: SPN, 1988. 632 pp.

LOUISE B. HAMMER
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

The author of *PSV* is a phonetician at Comenius University in Bratislava, and he has an international reputation for his work in phonetics. This book has now become a standard reference work on Slovak pronunciation.

The first edition of *PSV* was published in 1984. It is an orthoepic codification of Slovak and has been approved by the Orthoepic Commission of the Linguistics Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. *PSV* sets forth the linguistic norm for spoken Slovak, and is used for teaching standard Slovak pronunciation in the schools in Slovakia, as well as providing guidelines for people who speak professionally, such as broadcasters, singers and actors.

English speakers may not be familiar with the role of academies in standardizing languages, since no such institution exists for the English language. In fact, the English language has several national standards, e.g., British English, American English, Australian English. Pronunciation is the least standardized component of English, and these national standards reflect the pronunciation patterns in use by the speakers. In contrast, countries that have academies appoint linguistic commissions whose job is to compile rules, a codification, which show how the language should be used. France and the Czech and Slovak Federative Republic are among the countries that regulate their language usage in this manner.

It is not uncommon for an educated speaker of Slovak to speak in a way that does not conform to the rules set forth in the *PSV*. For example, a native of Bratislava, which is in the Western Slovak dialect area, would probably speak without diphthongs or the rhythmic law, since these features are not found in that dialect area. The speech of such a person would not be an example of "correct" Slovak pronunciation from an orthoepic point of view.

As Ān Bosák pointed out in his review of the first edition of

this book, the relationship of orthoepy to phonetics and phonology, as propounded by Ábel Král', was a point of contention between Král' and some linguists who have other theoretical points of view.¹ Specialists may also disagree about the pronunciations of particular words, and discussions of various points that are raised in this pioneering work will doubtless continue.

In the theoretical section of the first part of the book (pp. 11-35), Ábel Král' expands the definition of orthoepy, and compares his orthoepic codification of the spoken language to an orthographic codification of the written language. He is concerned with language cultivation (*jazyková kultúra*) and recognizes that stylistic differences dictate different pronunciation styles. He discusses the high and neutral styles, but not the low, which to him borders on the substandard. What Král' describes in the book is the neutral style, the public speech of educated people from the Central Slovak dialect area. The neutral style is distinguished from the high style by various features. For linguists, one of the most important is the pronunciation of the [ä] as the *e* in the English word 'set,' and not as the *a* in the English 'bat.' The high style is now primarily relegated to use in the classical theatre.

The phonetics section of the first part of the book (pp. 37-88) deals with phonetic transcription and with the phonetic classification of the sounds of Slovak and their correct production. The illustrations in this section are excellent visual aids when teaching Slovak pronunciation.

The first section of the second part of the book (pp. 89-103) systematically describes the pronunciations of the vowels, diphthongs and consonants of Slovak in combination. This section contains an excellent exposition of voicing assimilation. It is followed by a section on the suprasegmental characteristics of Slovak (pp. 163-189). Then come texts with their phonetic transcription and the author's comments (pp. 191-200).

The largest section of the book is taken up by the orthoepic dictionary (pp. 201-626). The orthographic form of the word appears in boldface, and it is followed by the phonetic transcription. The words that Král' selected for inclusion are those whose pronunciation cannot be deduced from their written form, or foreign words that may not yet follow the pronunciation rules of Slovak.

Masculine nouns that end in obstruents, which are subject to voicing assimilation, are given with both the voiceless and voiced variants. The nominative form is followed, in many instances, by the genitive case form, e.g., *baladik* — *baladi[k/g]*, — *[ka]*. Other cases are given when appropriate, such as, the genitive plural for some feminine and neuter nouns.

PSV has been written with precision and care. It is indispensable to teachers of the Slovak language, and belongs in the library of every Slovak specialist.

¹ *Slovenská reč*, 51, 1986 No. 6, pp. 371-374.

BOOKS AND ARTICLES RECEIVED

(a) From Eastern Europe

- Baranovský, Michal, "K niektorým otázkam spoločenského vývoja Československa v šesťdesiatych rokoch," *Historický časopis.*, 37 (No. 5, 1989).
- Bartalská, Ľubica, "K problematike vydávania americko-slovenskej mladežníckej tlače," *Slováci v zahraničí*, 15 (1989).
- Bartl, Július, "Mestá a mestecká Trenčianskej stolice v stredoveku," *Hč.*, (No. 5, 1988).
- Bartlová, Alena, "K dejinám potravinárskeho priemyslu na Slovensku v rokoch 1918-1938," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 2, 1989).
- Bielik, František, "Slovenské vyst'ahovalectvo v rokoch 1880-1914 a pramene jeho poznávania," *Slováci v zahraničí*, 15 (1989).
- Bobřík, Miroslav, "Nemecké telovýchovné organizácie a spolky na Slovensku v rokoch 1918-1928," *Hč.*, 36 (no. 4, 1988).
- Bodnárová, Miloslava, "Majetková štruktúra obyvateľstva Košíc v 16. storočí," *Historica Carpatica.*, 18 (1987).
- Bokesová-Uherová, Mária, *Dejiny zdravotníctva na Slovensku* (Martin: Osveta, 1989).
- Borguľa, Michal, *Rozprávanie z Dolnej zeme* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988).
- Bosic, Mila, *Narodna nošnja Slovaka u Vojvodini* (Novi sad: Vojvodanski muzej, 1987).
- Botík, Ján, ed., *Hont. Tradície ľudovej kultúry* (Martin: Osveta, 1988).
- Cambel, Samuel, "Otázka vzťahu revolúcie v českých krajinách a na Slovensku v rokoch 1944-1948," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 3, 1989).
- Čepan, Oskár, ed., *Jonáš Záborský, I & II*, (Bratislava: Tatran, 1989).
- Chropovský, Bohuslav & Alexander Ruttkey, "Archäologische Erforschung und Genese des slowakischen Etnikums," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).
- Daniel, David P., "Výskum obdobia reformácie na Slovensku," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 4, 1989).
- Daniš, Miroslav, "Husárske pluky na Ukrajine v 18. storočí a Slovensko," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 2, 1989).
- Eliáš, Michal ed., *Z prameňov národa. Na pamiatku stodvadsiateho piateho výročia vzniku Memoranda slovenského národa z roku 1861* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988).
- Fabian, Juraj, "Od Klebelsbergovho Memoranda k 'Americkej akcii,'" *Slováci v zahraničí*, 14 (1988).
- Fabricius, Miroslav, *Hospodársky vývoj Slovenska do konca predmníchovskej republiky* (Bratislava: Ekonomický ústav SAV, 1987).
- Fodor, Zoltan, *Národnostné školstvo v Slovenskej socialistickej republike* (Bratislava: SPN, 1988).
- Gajdoš, Marián, ed., *Vývoj a postavenie ukrajinskej národnosti na Slovensku v období výstavby socializmu* (Košice: Spoločenskovedný ústav SAV, 1989).
- Gašparíková, Viera ed., *Jánošík: obraz zbojníka v národnej kultúre* (Bratislava: Tatran, 1988).

- Gecelovský, Vladimír, "Socialno-politické postavenie a perzekúcie Cigánov na Gemeri v rokoch 1918-1945," *Historica Carpatica*, 18 (1987).
- Geguš, Ivan, *Kultúrno-politická orientácia Matice slovenskej v rokoch 1919-1938* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988).
- Grešík, Ladislav, "Medzinarodné súvislosti a vývin vnútropolitických pomerov v Československu v 60. rokoch," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 5, 1988).
- Habovštiak, Alojz, *Stredoveká dedina na Slovensku* (Bratislava: Slovenské národné múzeum, 1985).
- Halaga, Ondrej, " 'Dvojite Košice' a ich opevnenie," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 4, 1989).
- Hapák, Pavel, "K niektorým problémom dejín robotníckeho hnutia na Slovensku do roku 1918," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 4, 1989).
- Holec, Roman, "Mechanizácia ako súčasť poľnohospodárskej revolúcie na Slovensku v druhej polovici 19. storočia," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 4, 1988).
- Horváth, Pavel, "Zbytočný pokus o revíziu autorstva slovenských národných obrán z rokov 1821-1834," *Hč.*, 38 (No. 1, 1990).
- Hrnko, Anton, "Prejavy krízy ľudáckeho režimu na Slovensku v lete roku 1943," *Hč.*, 37 (no. 3, 1989).
- Hubenák, Ladislav, "Vznik Československa — zahraničný odboj a krajanovia," *Slováci v zahraničí*, 14 (1988).
- Jakešová, Elena, "Reemigrácia a vyst'ahovalectvo obyvateľstva Slovenska v období po vzniku Československej republiky," *Slováci v zahraničí*, 14 (1988).
- , "Americkí Slováci, zahraničný odboj a československá štátnosť (1914-1918)," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 5, 1989).
- Jakubíková, Kornélia, "The Participation of the Local Community in the Wedding in Slovakia," *Ethnologia Slavica*, 18 (1986).
- Kartous, Peter, "Národné kultúrne pamiatky v archívoch SSR," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 5, 1989).
- Klimko, Jozef, *Tretia ríša a ľudacký režim na Slovensku* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1986).
- Kollárová-Švorcová, Zuzana, "K problematike cigánskej otázky na Spiši (1918-1938)," *Slovenský národopis*, 36 (No. 1, 1988).
- Kováč, Andrej, "Vzt'ahy a riešenie agrárnej a ukrajinskej otázky v severovýchodných okresoch východného Slovenska v rokoch 1944-1960," *Historica Carpatica*, 18 (1987).
- Kováč, Dušan, "Slovenskí Nemci v ríšskonemeckej a sudetonemeckej politike," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 6, 1989).
- & Ľubomír Lipták, *Kapitoly z dejín (pre stredné školy)* (Bratislava: SPN, 1990).
- Krajčovič, Milan, "Slovania Podunajska v protirakúskom hnutí porevolučnej emigrácie," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 5, 1989).
- Krajčovič, Rudolf, "The Language in Great Moravia and Its Continuity with Slovak," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).
- Krajčovičová, Natalia, "Prejavy nespokojnosti s realizáciou pozemkovej reformy v prvej polovici dvadsiatych rokov," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 6, 1989).
- Kučera, Matúš, "Grossmähren und die Anfänge unserer nationalen Geschichte," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).

- Kuzmík, Jozef, *Knižná kultúra na Slovensku v stredoveku a renesancii* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1987).
- Lukačká, Ján, "Majetky a postavenia Ludanickovcov na Slovensku do začiatku 14. storočia," *Hč.*, 38 (No. 1, 1990).
- Magdolenová, Anna, "Československý kontext v slovenskom hudobnom umení v medzivojnovom období (1918-1939)," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 4, 1989).
- Magula, Rudolph, "Banícke školy na východnom Slovensku pred rokom 1918," *Historica Carpatica*, 18 (1987).
- Mannova, Elena, "Spolky a ich miesta v živote spoločnosti na Slovensku v 19. stor. Stav a problémy výskumu," *Hč.*, 38 (No. 1, 1990).
- Marsina, Richard, "Über die Besiedlung der Slowakei vom 11. bis in die Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).
- _____, "K najstarším dejinám Zvolena," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 6, 1989).
- _____, *A Grammar of Contemporary Slovak* (Bratislava: SPN, 1988).
- Oravec, Ján & Jozef Prokop, *Slovenčina pre krajanov hovoriacich po anglicky* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1986).
- Pleva, Ján, "Ideologická práca Komunistickej strany Československa v prvej polovici dvadsiatyh rokov," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 5, 1988).
- Podolák, Ján, "Organizational Forms of Pastoral Farming in Slovakia," *Ethnologia Slavica*, 15 (1983).
- Podolák, Ján, "Traditional Utilization of the Production of Sheep Milk," *Ethnologia Slavica*, 16 (1984).
- Potremra, Michal, "Niektoré otázky dejín južného Slovenska v rokoch 1938-1945," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 6, 1989).
- Pranda, Adam, "Die Slowakisch Rastelbinderei," *Ethnologia Slavica*, 17 (1985).
- Ratkoš, Peter, "The Territorial Development of Great Moravia (Fiction and Reality)," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).
- _____, *Slovensko v dobe veľkomoravskej* (Košice: Vychodoslovenské vydavateľstvo, 1988).
- Rohárik, pavel, *Terminológia remeselníckej výroby v Nadlaku* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1988).
- Ruman, Ladislav, "Československá sociálna demokracia v období dočasnej stabilizácie kapitalizmu (1924-1929)," *Hč.*, 38 (No. 1, 1990).
- Rychlík, Jan, "K otázke postavenia českého obyvateľstva na Slovensku v rokoch 1938-1945," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 3, 1989).
- _____, "Príprava a priebeh pozemkovej reformy na Slovensku v rokoch 1938-1945," *Agricultúra*, 22 (1989).
- Sedlák, Imrich ed., *Pavol Jozef Šafárik a slovenské národné obrodenie* (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1989).
- Sedlák, Vincent, "Nichtmagyarische Einflüsse in den Anfängen des ungarischen Staates," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).
- Sikora, Stanislav, "Problémy rozvoja socialistického demokratizmu v činnosti národných výborov na Slovensku na začiatku 50. rokov," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 6, 1989).

- Šimončič, Jozef & Jozef Watzka eds., *Dejiny Trnavy* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1988).
- Škvarna, Dušan, "Prípravy septembrového ozbrojeného povstania v roku 1848," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 5, 1988).
- _____, "Priebeh a výsledky septembrového ozbrojeného povstania roku 1848," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 2, 1989).
- Slavkovský, Peter, "Die Migration zur landwirtschaftlichen Saisonarbit und ihre Bedeutung für die Entwicklung der Volkskultur in der Slowakei," *Ethnologia Slavica*, 15 (1983).
- Slovenský biografický slovník (od roku 833 do roku 1990)*, III (K-I), (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1989).
- Šmatlák, Stanislav, *Dejiny slovenskej literatúry od stredoveku po súčasnosť* (Bratislava: Tatran, 1988).
- Sopko, Július, "Questions of Cultural Influences and Level of Learning During the First Centuries of the Hungarian State," *Studia Historica Slovaca*, XVI (1988).
- Špiesz, Anton, *Bratislava v 18. storočí* (Bratislava: Tatran, 1987).
- Spira, György, "Stretnutie Jána Rotaridesa s revolúciou a kontrarevolúciou," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 5, 1988).
- Števec, Juraj, ed., *Dejiny slovenského romanu* (Bratislava: Tatran, 1989).
- Štilla, Miloš, "Paradesantná brigáda v partizánskej vojne," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 3, 1989).
- Stolárík, M. Mark, "Slovenskí prísťahovalci a ich postoje v rokoch 1885-1919," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 6, 1989).
- Strelko, Amon, "Vnútropolitický vývoj ľudackého tábora v rokoch 1941-1942," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 3, 1989).
- Tajták, Ladislav, "Vznik Robotníckeho vzdelávacieho spolku v Košiciach," *Historica Carpatica*, 18 (1987).
- _____, "K otázke ľavicovej opozície v uhorskej a slovenskej sociálnej demokracii a vzniku tzv. Hornouhorskej sociálnodemokratickej strany," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 4, 1988).
- Tibenský, Ján et. al., *Priekopníci vedy a techniky na Slovensku II* (Bratislava: Obzor, 1988).
- Tichý, Miloslav, "K dejinám Lekárskej fakulty v Bratislave v rokoch 1919-1939," *Hč.*, 37 (No. 5, 1989).
- Uličný, Ferdinand, "Vývoj osídlenia horného povodia Ondavy do začiatku 17. storočia," *Historica Carpatica*, 18 (1987).
- Višvader, František, *Malý album veľkých osobností (Portréty významných činiteľov československého komunistického hnutia)* (Bratislava: SPN, 1988).
- Vozár, Jozef, "Začiatky banického vysokého školstva na území Československa," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 5, 1988).
- Winters, Stanley B., "Vývoj bádání o dějinách Československa ve Spojených státech," *Časopis Matice moravské*, CVIII (No. 2, 1989).
- Žatkuliak, Jozef, "Národné výbory na Slovensku pri riadení poľnohospodárstva po zasadaní ÚV KSČ v júni 1955," *Hč.*, 36 (No. 4, 1988).
- Zubercová, Magdaléna M., *Tisícročie módy. Z dejín odievania na Slovensku* (Martin: Osveta, 1988).

(b) from the West

- Baumgarten, R. Vladimir, "T.G. Masaryk: The Making of a Founding Father," *The Central European Forum*, 2 (No. 4, 1989).
- Baumgarten, R. Vladimir & Joseph Stefka, *The National Slovak Society: 100 Year History, 1890-1990* (Pittsburgh: National Slovak Society, 1990).
- Borchert, James & Susan, *Lakewood: The First Hundred Years* (Norfolk, VA: Donning publishing Co., 1989).
- Brown, Janice, *Conscience and Captivity: Religion in Eastern Europe* (Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1989).
- Deák, István, "Uncovering Eastern Europe's Dark History," *Orbis: A Journal of World Affairs*, 34 (No. 1, 1990).
- , *Beyond Nationalism: A Social and Political History of the Habsburg Officer Corps, 1848-1918* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Drobena, Thomas John, "The Influence of Irish-Keltic Church Architecture on the Slavic Church Buildings of the Great Moravian Period," *Slovak Studies*, XXII (1982).
- Đurica, Milan S., "The Political Activities of Dr. Jozef Kirschbaum in 1939-1945 (As Described in Secret German Documents)," *Slovak Studies*, XXV (1985).
- Đurovič, Ľubomír, "The Language of the Valaska Sskola," in Gerald J. Sabo ed., *Hugolín Gavlovič's Valaská Škola* (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1988).
- Glettler, Monika, "Die Slowaken in Pressburg und Budapest um 1900," *Slowakei*, XXVI (1989).
- Grébert, Arvéd, "Der Selbständikeitswille der Slowaken in den Jahren 1919-1920," *Slowakei*, XXVI (1989).
- Havel, Václav, "New Year's Address," *Orbis: A Journal of World Affairs*, 34 (No. 2, 1990).
- Hnilica, Ján, "Sts. Cyril and Methodius and Their Attitudes Towards the Holy Scripture and Rome," *Slovak Studies*, XXII (1982).
- Hodos, George H., *Stalinist Purges in Eastern Europe, 1948-1954* (New York: Praeger, 1987).
- Hoensch, Joerg K., *A History of Modern Hungary, 1867-1986* (London and New York: Longman, 1988).
- Hrabovec, Anton, "Slowaken in Österreich," *Slowakei*, XXV (1988).
- Jelinek, Yeshayahu, "Slovaks and the Holocaust: Attempts at Reconciliation," *Soviet Jewish Affairs*, 19 (No. 1, 1989).
- , "Slovaks, Germans, the 'Satellites', and Jews," *Cross Currents: A Yearbook of Central European Culture*, 9 (1990).
- Johnson, Owen V., "Newspapers and Nation-Building: The Slovak Press in Pre-1918 Slovakia," in Hans Lemberg et. al., *Bildungsgeschichte, Bevölkerungsgeschichte und Gesellschaftsgeschichte in den böhemischer Ländern und in Europa* (Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 1988).
- , "Clio Among the Ethnic Media," *Ethnic Forum*, 8 (No. 1, 1988).

- Kalvoda, Josef, "Federalist thought in Czechoslovakia During the Interwar Years," *Slovakia*, XXXIII (1987-88).
- , "National Minorities Under Communism: The Case of Czechoslovakia," *Nationalities Papers*, XVI (No. 1, 1988).
- , "Czechoslovak-Ukrainian Relations," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, XLIV (Nos. 1-2, 1988).
- , "The Czechoslovak Army in the Civil War in Russia," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, XLV (No. 1, 1989).
- , "The Origins of Czechoslovakia (Russia — The Home Front)," in Norman Stone & Edward Strouhal eds., *Czechoslovakia: Crossroads and Crises, 1918-1988* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989).
- Keller, Hans, "Meine fünf Jahre in der Slowakei, 1939-1945," *Slowakei*, XXV (1988).
- Kirschbaum, J.M., "Für ein neues Mitteleuropa," *Slowakei*, XXVI (1989).
- Kirschbaum, Stanislav J., "Slovak Nationalism in the First Czechoslovak Republic of 1918-1938," *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*, XVI (Nos. 1-2, 1989).
- Komlos, John, *Nutrition and Economic Development in the 18th-Century Habsburg Monarchy: An Anthropometric History* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1989).
- Kona, Martha M. & William, *Arcibiskup Dr. Karol Kmet'ko* (Cambridge, Ontario: Dobra kniha, 1989).
- Kopanic, Michael J., Jr., "Sjednocovanie sociálno-demokratických odborových organizácií na Slovensku v rokoch 1918-1920," *Premeny*, 24 (No. 4, 1987).
- , "Conflict and Cooperation Among East Central European Immigrants: Slovak Perspectives on Relations with Magyars in Cleveland, 1880-1930," in *Western Reserve Studies Symposium* (Cleveland: Western Reserve Historical Society, 1989).
- Korec, Ján (Bishop), "Letter to *Rudé Právo* (October, 1987)," *Furdek*, XXVIII (1989).
- Kovtun, Jiří, *Masarykův triumf: Příběh konce velké války* (Toronto: Sixty-Eight Publishers, 1987).
- Krafcik, Patricia A., "Jánošík: Unraveling the Man from the Legend," *Slovakia*, XXXIII (1987-88).
- Kupke, Raymond J., "The Slovak National Catholic Church, Passaic, New Jersey, and the Jezusko Affair," *Slovakia*, XXXIII (1987-88).
- Kútnik, Jozef, "Benedictine Missionaries in Slovakia in the 9th-11th Centuries," *Slovak Studies*, XXII (1982).
- Litva, Felix J., "Bibliography of the Cyrillo-Methodian Mission in Great Moravia," *Slovak Studies*, XXII (1982).
- Mamatey, Victor S., "The Change of Presidential Guard, 1935: Masaryk's Abdication — Beneš's Election," *Kosmas*, VII (No. 2, 1988).
- , "The United States and Czechoslovak Independence," in *Czechoslovakia: Crossroads and Crises, 1918-1988*, ed. by Norman Stone & Eduard Strouhal (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989).
- McCagg, William O., *A History of the Habsburg Jews, 1670-1988* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988).

- Molenda, Danuta, "Technological Innovation in Central Europe between the XIVth and the XVIIth Centuries," *Journal of European Economic History*, 17 (No. 1, 1988).
- Pastor, Peter, ed., *Revolutions and Interventions in Hungary and Its Neighboring States, 1918-1919* (Highland Lakes, N.J.: Atlantic Studies on Society in Change, 1988 [E. European Monographs, #240]).
- Pehe, Jiri, ed., *The Prague Spring: A Mixed Legacy* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988).
- Rynsent, Robert B., ed., *Decadence and Innovation: Austro-Hungarian Life and Art at the Turn of the Century* (London: Weidenfeld, 1989).
- _____, "Národnosti južného Slovenska v Habajových a Bellekových dielach," *Romboid*, XXIV (1989).
- _____, ed., *T.G. Masaryk (1850-1937), II: Thinker and Critic* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989).
- Rothschild, Joseph, *Return to Diversity: A Political History of East Central Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Rydlo, Jozef M., "Helvetus Peregrinus, William Ritter et la Slovaquie: une page inconnue de nos relations avec l'étranger," *HISPO* (Berne), 10 (1989).
- _____, *Publishing Activity of the Slovak Institute of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Rome, 1963-1988* (Rome: Slovak Institute, 1989).
- Sabo, Gerald J., ed., *Hugolín Gavlovič's Valaská Škola* (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1988).
- Samal, Mary Hrabik & Zdenka Brodská, "The Lukavica Notebooks," *Cross Currents*, 9 (1990).
- Sked, Alan, *The Decline and Fall of the Habsburg Empire, 1815-1918* (London and New York: Longman, 1989).
- Skilling, H. Gordon, "Czechoslovakia Between East and West," in William W. Griffith ed., *Central and Eastern Europe: The Opening Curtain?* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1989).
- Špetko, Jozef, "Boh, Hospodin, Jahve, Allah v našom čase a priestore. Príspevok k poznaniu slovenskej cirkevno-historickej a konfesionálno-historickej literatúry," *Most*, XXXVI (No. 3-4, 1989).
- _____, "Religious Cults in Slovakia Before [the] Arrival of [the] Slavs," *Slovak Studies*, XXII (1982).
- Stolarik, M. Mark, "Slovak Immigration to the United States and Its Relation to the American Socialist and Labor Movements," *Slovakia*, XXXIII (1987-88).
- _____, (pseud. Leo Carpenter), "Looking for Mr. Glasnost: Scenes from Today's [1988] Czechoslovakia," *Crisis: A Journal of Lay Catholic Opinion*, 7 (No. 7, 1989).
- _____, *Immigration and Urbanization: The Slovak Experience, 1870-1918* (New York: AMS Press, 1989).
- _____, "Slovak Easter Customs in the United States," *The World & I*, V (No. 4, 1990).
- Stoličná, Rastislava, "The Ways of Food Preservation in Slovakia," in Astri Riddervold & Andreas Ropeid eds., *Food Conservation* (London: Prospect Books, 1988).

-
- Sutherland, Anthony X., "Studies Into the Intellectual History of Slovak Nationalism (1500's-1914)," *Slovak Studies*, XXV (1985).
- Tatarka, Dominik *et. al.*, "Deportations of Jews from Slovakia: [A] Declaration," (translated by F.W. Galan), *Cross Currents*, 9 (1990).
- Unterberger, Betty M., *The United States, Revolutionary Russia and the Rise of Czechoslovakia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989).
- Wandycz, Piotr S., *The Twilight of the French Eastern Alliance, 1926-1936: French-Czechoslovak-Polish Relations from Locarno to the Remilitarization of the Rhineland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988).
- Winters, Stanley B., ed., *T.G. Masaryk (1850-1937). I: Thinker and Politician* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).

CONTRIBUTORS

DAVID P. DANIEL, Ph.D. (The Pennsylvania State University), is a specialist in the history of Slovakia and the Austrian Empire during the early modern era. He has published numerous articles and several books on the Reformation and on Slovakia during the sixteenth century. He was a Senior Fulbright Researcher in Bratislava in 1988-1990, and he also served as a special consultant to the Slovak Ministry of Culture and Education after the "velvet revolution" of November, 1989.

STANISLAV J. KIRSCHBAUM, D. Rech. (Paris), is Professor of International Studies at Glendon College, York University, Toronto. A specialist on modern Slovakia (1939-1990), he has published many articles on this subject, edited two books and most recently published *Slovaques et Tchèques. Essai sur un nouvel aperçu de leur histoire politique* (1987).

JÁN CHRYZOSTOM KOREC, S.J., is Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Nitra, Slovakia. He was one of four Jesuits secretly ordained as a Bishop in 1950 after the Communists suppressed all religious orders as a part of their all-out war against religion in Czechoslovakia. In the 1950's Bishop Korec worked as a manual laborer and, wherever possible, he secretly ordained priests and helped to educate them. In 1960 the secret police arrested him and he was sentenced to 12 years in prison. Freed in 1968, and fully rehabilitated in 1969, he had to return to manual labor after the "consolidation" process of 1970. Constantly harrassed by the secret police in the 1970's and 1980's, Bishop Korec nevertheless participated in the Catholic opposition to the new Stalinist regime and helped plan various pilgrimages and demonstrations, notably the March 25, 1988 [Good Friday] candlelight procession in Bratislava, which was broken up by police using water cannons and trun-

cheons and was the first public demonstration against the Stalinist regime since 1969. He was also a co-signer of the "Declaration Regarding the Deportation of Jews from Slovakia" in the fall of 1987, which was initiated by his friend Dominik Tatarka. Bishop Korec brought Tatarka back to the Roman Catholic faith as this dissident writer's health began to fail. Pope John Paul II appointed Korec Bishop of Nitra, Slovakia's oldest Diocese, on February 6, 1990.

MICHAEL KRAUS, Ph.D. (Princeton University) is Associate Professor of Political Science at Middlebury College, Vermont. He was a Ford Foundation Fellow at the Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University, in 1982-83, and a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Harriman Institute for Advanced Soviet Studies, Columbia University, 1986-87. He has written on Soviet and East European Affairs in both contemporary and historical contexts. Most recently, he is editor (along with Ronald Liebowitz) of *Perestroika and East-West Economic Relations: Prospects for the 1990's* (New York University Press, 1990).

EWA KOWALSKÁ, Ph.D. (Comenius University), is a member of the Historical Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, Division for late Feudal History. She specializes in the history of education in Slovakia during the Enlightenment and has published a number of articles and the monograph *Štátne ľudové školstvo na Slovensku na prelome 18. a 19. storočia* (1987). She has also taught at Comenius University and has participated in various international scholarly conferences.

JÁN ŠIMKO, Ph.D. (Comenius University), was a Professor of English at Comenius until 1967. After the Soviet-led invasion of 1968 he decided to remain in the West. He is a specialist on Shakespeare and the author of over 100 articles. His most notable achievement was the publication of the *English-Slovak Dictionary* (3 editions, 1967, 1968 and 1971) in Bratislava, Slovakia. A revised and updated version of this dictionary is about to be published by the Slovak World Congress. Dr. Šimko was the first Scholar in Residence and Visiting Professor of English at West Virginia University in Parkesburg, where he spent the 1989-1990 academic year.

GUIDELINES FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts of articles for publication should be sent to the editor. Articles should normally not exceed twenty-five pages in length, and should be submitted in triplicate, typed double-spaced, with generous margins for copyediting. Footnotes should also be double-spaced, numbered, and placed at the end of the paper. Text and format should adhere to the style outlined in Kate Turabian's *A Manual for Writers*. Proper orthography and diacritical marks must be supplied for all foreign words. Manuscripts will not be returned unless specifically requested and postage is provided.

Books for review are to be sent to the editor. Unsolicited book reviews are not encouraged.

Individuals who wish to review books should request them from the editor. They should send a 'curriculum vitae' with their request.

HAMMER 1999.121

THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Organized in 1907

EDWARD J. BEHUNCIK, K.S.G., Honorary President

DANIEL F. TANZONE
President

JOHN A. HOLY
Secretary-Treasurer

JOSEPH J. TALAFOUS, Esq.
Vice-President

ANNE Z. SAROSY
Vice-President

PHILIP R. TUHY
Vice-President

Executive Committee

Daniel F. Tanzone, Edward J. Behuncik, John A. Holy, Anna S. Granchay
Joseph R. Kristofik, Steve J. Hruska, Cecilia Sarocky, Andrew F. Hudak, Jr.,
Joseph Stefka, Stephen J. Kavulich, Justine Wesnak,
Edward A. Zelenak, M. Mark Stolarik, Ph.D., Igor Uhrík

Anna M. Vizza, President, Ladies Auxiliary

Patrick Zelenak
Youth Director

SLOVAK FRATERNAL ORGANIZATIONS AFFILIATED WITH THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA

FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK LADIES ASSOCIATION
Cleveland, Ohio

FIRST CATHOLIC SLOVAK UNION OF THE U.S. AND CANADA
Cleveland, Ohio

SLOVAK CATHOLIC SOKOL
Passaic, N.J.

NATIONAL SLOVAK SOCIETY OF THE U.S.A.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

LADIES PENNSYLVANIA SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA SLOVAK CATHOLIC UNION
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

FIRST SLOVAK WREATH OF THE FREE EAGLE
Bridgeport, Conn.

SLOVAK NEWSPAPERMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

THE SLOVAK GARDEN, INC.
Winter Park, Florida

SLOVAKIA

\$6.00 per issue

Printed By
JEDNOTA PRESS

A Division of Jednota Communications, Inc.
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057
U.S.A.